DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 405 HE 020 050

AUTHOR Fincher, Cameron, Ed.; And Others
TITLE Higher Education in Georgia: Assessment, Evaluation, and Accreditation. Proceedings of the Conference (Athens, Georgia, January 15-16, 1986).
INSTITUTION Georgia Univ., Athens. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Jan 86
NOTE 94p.; Paper collected as part of the American Association for Higher Education Assessment Forum.
AVAILABLE FROM Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30502.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; *Accreditation (Institutions); Adult Students; College Admission; Developmental Studies Programs; *Educational Assessment; Educational Change; Educational Testing; *Evaluation Criteria; Graduation Requirements; Higher Education; Institutional Research; Instructional Development; Nontraditional Students; *Outcomes of Education; *Student Evaluation; Technical Education; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *AAHE Assessment Forum; *Georgia

ABSTRACT

Higher education assessment, evaluation, and accreditation in Georgia are addressed in these proceedings of a 1986 conference sponsored by the University of Georgia and the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Panel papers cover: assessing student performance and outcomes, academic standards and needs assessment for specific fields, and SACS' new accreditation criteria and implications of the criteria. The keynote address by Cameron Fincher is entitled "The Emerging Role of Assessment and Evaluation in Postsecondary Education." Panel papers and authors are as follows: "Assessing Student Achievement" (Joe Marks); "Assessing Educational Outcomes" (Thomas E. R. Redmon); "Assessing Vocational Competencies" (Michael T. McCord); "Statewide Needs Assessment for Health Personnel" (Libby V. Morris); "Assessing the New Standards for High School Graduation and College Admissions" (Nathaniel Pugh, Jr.); "Needs Assessment in Vocational Technical Education" (Kenneth R. Allen); "The New Criteria For Accreditation" (James T. Rogers); the implications of new SACS criteria for the following areas--"Institutional Research" (Larry G. Jones), "Developmental Studies" (Leroy Ervin, Louise M. Tomlinson), "Instructional Development" (Ronald D. Simpson), "College Admissions" (John W. Albright), "Adult Learners" (Margaret E. Holt), "Higher Education's Changing Clientele" (Herman B. Smith), and "Changing Accreditation Criteria: Catalyst to Education Innovation?" (Sven Groennings). (SW)

ED281405

HIGHER EDUCATION IN GEORGIA: ASSESSMENT, EVALUATION, AND ACCREDITATION

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE
JANUARY 15-16, 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Cameron Fincher

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EDITORS

Cameron Fincher
Larry G. Jones
Joyce Placek

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 020 050

SPONSORED BY

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND PLANNING
INSTITUTE OF HIGHER EDUCATION
CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One Dupont Circle
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
202/293-6440

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Board of Directors

Chair
Joseph F. Kauffman
University of Wisconsin
Madison

Chair-Elect
Adele S. Simmons
Hampshire College

Vice Chair
Reatha Clark King
Metropolitan State University

Past Chair
Harriet W. Sheridan
Brown University

Carlos H. Arce
NuStats, Inc.

Estela M. Bensimon
Teachers College
Columbia University

Anne L. Bryant
American Association of
University Women

Donald L. Fruehling
McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Ellen V. Futter
Barnard College

Jerry G. Gaff
Hamline University

Zelda F. Gamson
University of Michigan

Stephen R. Graubard
Daedalus

Joseph Katz
State University of New York
at Stony Brook

Arthur E. Levine
Bradford College

Frank Newman
Education Commission
of the States

Alan Pifer
Carnegie Corporation
of New York

W. Ann Reynolds
The California State
University

Piedad F. Robertson
Miami-Dade Community
College

D. Wayne Silby
Groupware Systems

P. Michael Timpane
Teachers College
Columbia University

President
Russell Edgerton

The AAHE ASSESSMENT FORUM is a three-year project supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. It entails three distinct but overlapping activities:

--an annual conference
(the first scheduled for June 14-17, 1987, in Denver)

--commissioned papers
(focused on implementation and other timely assessment concerns; available through the Forum for a small fee)

--information services
(including consultation, referrals, a national directory, and more)

This paper is part of an on-going assessment collection maintained by the Forum. We are pleased to make it more widely available through the ERIC system.

For further information about ASSESSMENT FORUM activities, contact Patricia Hutchings, Director, AAHE ASSESSMENT FORUM, One Dupont Circle, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036

Preface

"Higher Education In Georgia: Assessment, Evaluation, and Accreditation" is the theme of the third research conference cosponsored by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning and the Institute of Higher Education at the University of Georgia. The conference was held January 15-16, 1986 at the Center for Continuing Education and involved over 100 registered participants from over thirty-five different institutions of postsecondary education and ten educational agencies.

The conference was conducted in cooperation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and addressed the assessment and evaluation implications of SACS new criteria for accreditation. The conference theme and program topics were developed at a planning conference held at the Athens Holiday Inn on November 5, 1985. Present at that planning conference were representatives of the various institutions and agencies who had expressed an interest in the research conference. The success of the third annual research conference thus is the result of the planning conference and the willingness of the planning participants to contribute to the later conference by preparing papers for presentation.

An expression of appreciation is in order for each program participant who prepared a paper for presentation at the research conference or who readily agreed to chair panel discussions. A special note of appreciation is due Dr. James T. Rogers, Director of the Commission on Colleges, who discussed SACS new criteria for accreditation at the dinner and contributed substantially to the panel discussions the following day. His participation throughout the conference was especially appreciated by those attending.

Participant response to the research conference underscores the widespread interest in the research concerns and issues of postsecondary education in Georgia, and in conferring with colleagues with similar concerns and professional experience. One decision made at the conference was to continue the annual conference, and it is anticipated that the fourth conference will be held in the fall of 1986.

The editors of the proceedings are indebted to Donna Davis, Institute of Higher Education, and Josephine Coile, Office of Institutional Research and Planning, for the competence and promptness with which they prepared camera-ready copy for the printers. The editors are also pleased with the cooperation of many others who have made the early publication of the proceedings possible.

Cameron Fincher
Larry G. Jones
Joyce Placek

TABLE OF CONTENTS

KEYNOTE ADDRESS PAGE

The Emerging Role of Assessment and Evaluation in Postsecondary Education
Cameron Fincher 1
Institute of Higher Education

FIRST PANEL ON ASSESSMENT

Assessing Student Achievement
Joe Marks 13
Southern Regional Education Board

Assessing Educational Outcomes
Thomas E. R. Redmon 19
Southern Regional Education Board

Assessing Vocational Competencies
Michael T. McCord 25
Athens Vocational/Technical School

SECOND PANEL ON ASSESSMENT

Statewide Needs Assessment For Health Personnel
Libby V. Morris 35
Institute of Higher Education

Assessing the New Standards for High School Graduation and College Admissions
Nathaniel Pugh, Jr. 41
Georgia Southern College

Needs Assessment in Vocational Technical Education
Kenneth R. Allen 49
Georgia State University

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd) PAGE

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS CRITERIA

The New Criteria for Accreditation
James T. Rogers 53
Commission on Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges & Schools

FIRST PANEL ON IMPLICATIONS OF SACS' NEW CRITERIA

Institutional Research
Larry G. Jones 59
Institutional Research and Planning

Developmental Studies
Leroy Ervin and Louise M. Tomlinson 65
Division of Developmental Studies

Instructional Development
Ronald D. Simpson 67
Office of Instructional Development

College Admissions
John W. Albright 71
Office of Admissions

SECOND PANEL ON IMPLICATIONS OF SACS' NEW CRITERIA

Adult Learners
Margaret E. Holt. 75
Adult Education Department

Higher Education's Changing Clientele
Herman B. Smith 79
Institute of Higher Education

Changing Accreditation Criteria:
Catalyst to Education Innovation?
Sven Groennings 83
Institute of Higher Education

APPENDIX A 93

Keynote Address

THE EMERGING ROLE OF ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Cameron Fincher
Regents Professor and Director
Institute of Higher Education

Some of us have been around enough to suspect that education is cyclic in its emphases and interests. If we couldn't catch a challenging public issue in time to enjoy its moment before spotlights, we soon learned to hold onto our lecture notes until the issue came around again. It is not impossible that next time around, we can catch the same issue in its early returning stages and earn a bit of acclaim by saying again what we have said before.

The current concern with assessment and evaluation may be such a topic. We are much concerned with educational outcomes as we were in the late 1960s following the Equality Opportunity Study mandated by Congress in 1964 (Coleman, et al., 1966). And we are much alarmed over the quality of public schooling as we were in 1957 following the launching of the Russian Sputnik. We are again aware that education cannot be judged solely by the public resources allocated to schools and colleges, and certainly not by the internal processes of educational institutions and programs. We are once again in quest of hard, empirical, indisputable evidence that schools and colleges are instilling, "the knowledge, capacities, and skills" that students ought to acquire—and that society has a right to expect!

In each case we are probably right. But only because of the unbelievable complexity of secondary and postsecondary education in the United States, and because of our remarkable commitment to cultural pluralism in an increasingly diverse society. The quality of education is not so much in evidence as the uneven diversity of educational institutions, programs, and personnel. The decline in academic standards is not so much a problem as the conflicting demands and confused expectations placed upon education in the last three years of secondary education and the first two years of postsecondary education. Even our demands for accountability have blown hot and cold, as we have confused institutional impact with administration or fiscal responsibility, and instructional accountability with declines in student performance and/or academic standards.

Irrespective of our confused demands and expectations, we are nonetheless certain that the problems and issues of postsecondary education can be resolved through the uses and application of systematic and objective methods of measurement, assessment, and evaluation. We take for granted that such methods are available and that the professional or technical expertise of measurement assessment, and evaluation specialists can be brought to bear on "a confidence crisis" that apparently began with student protests, test score decline, grade inflation, and other indications that all is not well with the nation's schools and colleges. For those of us with training and experience in testing and measurement, the renewed interest would be flattering if it were not blurred by a strong sense of deja vu.

Measurement and Evaluation

The push for measurement and evaluation was quite strong in the 1940s and the 1950s when the measurement of individual differences was essential to the counseling and guidance of students in a democratic society. A strong emphasis was placed upon achievement testing and the improvement of education through the construction and development of better educational achievement tests. A course in testing was believed to be a necessary component of teacher education.

In psychological testing a notion of general ability or general intelligence was countered by notions of special abilities that required separate tests. In addition to educational achievement and special abilities, there was an increasing concern with the emotional and social adjustments of students, as they adapted to the demands of life, and with the measurement of attitudes, opinions, and interests, as such characteristics influenced personal decisions. These were the days in which thousands of school students took the Kuder Preference Record by punching holes with a metal pin in an answer pad and then counting the circles the pin had penetrated.

These were also days in which a psychological concept of the whole individual had commendable influence upon educational practices. Educational and psychological characteristics were to be measured by systematic and objective tests and inventories. Growth and development was to be evaluated by changes in test performance from various levels of formal education. A fairly common practice was to give some kind of readiness test at the beginning of the primary grades, followed by achievement tests in reading and arithmetic at the third or fourth grade levels. At the ninth grade level, it was common to test for specific areas of educational achievement in such areas as science, mathematics, English, and history. Quite often these tests were used in courses called vocational guidance and students were given various kinds of assistance in their choice of career and educational programs.

The purposes of evaluation, according to a classic textbook of the day (Remmers and Gage, 1955), were :

1. To maintain standards,
2. To select students,
3. To motivate learning,
4. To guide teaching,
5. To appraise teachers, teaching methods, teaching books, curricula content, etc., and
6. To furnish educational experience (p. 10).

In brief, the purposes of testing were to select from among diverse individuals the one or more persons best suited for a particular job or educational program and conversely, to give to a single individual assistance in the many choices and decisions concerning career and education.

The National Defense Act of 1957 was indicative of the forces favoring selective admissions to educational institutions and programs. Too many students were regarded as deficient in science, mathematics, and foreign languages. As a result, a great emphasis was placed upon recruiting students and admitting them selectively to enriched programs in the three respective areas. As "the impending tidalwave" of the 1960s became a reality, a greater emphasis was placed upon selective admissions. It was thought at that time that selective admissions would be the only way in which institutions of postsecondary education could cope with the increased numbers of applicants.

At the same time testing and measurement were attacked viciously by a group of self-appointed critics who published books under such salacious titles as, "the tyranny of testing," and "the brain watchers." Such an attack on testing came at a time when schools and colleges were increasing greatly the amount and kind of testing that they were doing for educational purposes. Under the confusions of the time, it is understandable why the uses of testing and measurement for the improvement of instruction were never quite realized.

From Measurement To Assessment

The changes in testing and measurement purposes may be seen by scanning E. F.

Lindquist's 1951 version of "Educational Measurement" and Robert L. Thorndike's 1971 version of the same book--both versions, of course, being published by the American Council on Education. It is most interesting that the first chapter in the 1951 edition is entitled "The Function of Measurement in the Facilitation of Learning" and was written by Walter W. Cook of the University of Minnesota. The only comparable chapter in the 1971 edition is entitled "Measurement in Learning and Instruction," and was written by Robert Glaser and Anthony J. Nitko. Thorndike uses the first chapter of the 1971 edition to discuss the many changes that have taken place in testing as the result of technological development, the advent of large-scale testing programs, large-scale psychometric research projects, the development of instructional systems, and other advances in testing technology. It is evident from Thorndike's chapter that testing in 1971 was greatly concerned with the formulation of behaviorial objectives, domain sampling, response sets and stylistic factors, and placement/classification applications as opposed to selection and prediction.

In discussing the impact of testing upon education, Thorndike emphasized the invasion of privacy issue in the 1960s and the resulting fairness issue. The influence of decision theory is much in evidence in the chapter on "Use of Measurement in Selection and Placement," written by John Hills, and in the closing chapter, "The Evaluation of Educational Programs," written by Alexander Astin and Robert J. Panos. By the 1970s, educational evaluation was quite sensitive to the assessment of inputs, processes, and outputs. The influence of Campbell and Stanley's "quasi-experimental" designs was also evident and the principal purpose is readily identified as information that could guide decisions concerning the adoption or modification of an educational program.

If we ask then what are the changing concepts of assessment, measurement, and evaluation as they evolved since WWII, we should appreciate some subtle distinctions in usage. Assessment--as the term is used--apparently means "to estimate, appraise, or size-up learner attributes or characteristics that cannot easily be measured." Much of the time, our assessment problems deal with such matters as personal experiences, learning strategies, and career aspirations. They continue to deal, of course, with personal or social characteristics which can be judged but which do not easily lend themselves to measurement.

Measurement apparently continues to mean to determine the amount, magnitude, extent, or degree of skills, competences, abilities, achievements, and accomplishments. Examples of these are the specialized skills or competences and the special abilities such as we find in technical education. It often includes the basic academic skills such as reading writing, and mathematics--skills that ostensibly can still be measured.

The term evaluation does not mean "to judge the merit or worth of changes in performance and or behavior," as much as it does to determine the effectiveness of programs and projects that are designed to produce the changes. Evidently, we have evolved a usage in which we tend to evaluate programs and projects, but not to evaluate individuals or the change in their behavior or performance. To the contrary, we find an increasing tendency to use the word assessment for such purposes.

Criteria That Must Be Met

Irrespective of the subtle differences that might exist among measurement, assessment, and evaluation there are criteria that all three methods must meet. Among these criteria are those of systematic, objective, valid, and reliable observation and/or inference. In brief, assessment and evaluation in the 1980s must meet the traditional criteria that were specified for tests and measurements quite early in their development.

Traditionally, we have defined the objectivity of tests and measurements as the extent to which trained users can agree on the

interpretation and use of results. We try to impose system and objectivity on assessment and evaluative efforts by specifying the conditions under which we will assess and evaluate. Validity is usually defined as the degree to which tests measure what they are intended to measure. Another definition might be the precision and accuracy with which test scores designate performance or competence. In matters of test validity there has been a strong shift away from predictive validity and content validity, in favor of construct validity. Beyond any doubt, the kind of validity that assessment and evaluation methods should have in the 1980s is educational construct validity.

Reliability—the stability or dependability of assessment or evaluation results—is still determined primarily in terms of internal consistency. There remain too many difficulties in test-retest correlations in which an assessment instrument is used on different occasions.

All assessment instruments must meet certain criteria pertaining to practical use. In short, the cost of assessment materials must not be prohibitive; there must be some practicality concerning the administration, interpretation and reporting of assessment results; and there must be some concern with the distribution of interpretive information that will facilitate the decisions and choices that presumably will be made on the basis of assessment information.

Two new criteria have been introduced since the 1960s and are now criteria which all assessment instruments must meet. These may be identified simply as the criteria of (a) credibility and (b) fairness. In other words, there must be an absence of deception or concealment in the use and application of assessment methods. The reasons for the assessment must be obvious to those whose performance or competence are being assessed. The educational uses of disguised, "tricky" tests and exams have never been justified. At the moment, it is best to say not only are they not justified, they may be illegal.

In much the same manner, there must be a removal of age, sex, and race biases that may enter into the content analysis and reporting, and use of assessment results. Although age, sex, and race continue to be variables that are related to assessment data and information, they must not be interpreted as determinants and their influence on educational decisions, choices, and judgments must not be dominant.

The changing emphases in testing and measurement thus represent a shift from a concern with measurement per se to the assessment of changes in behavior and performance that can be attributed to learning and development. Two other emphases that have been noticed are: (a) a shift from a concern with the evaluation of people to the evaluation of programs, and (b) a concern with the measurement of skills, abilities, or competence as opposed to the measurement of aptitudes. Each of these changing emphases in education should be welcomed.

Why Assess?

If we ask why we are so actively concerned with assessment, the reasons are the same that have been given in the past for our concern with testing and measuring. We assess in order to learn what students have learned; if they have learned what they have been taught; and how well they have learned. We also assess in order to make informed decisions and choices. Critics of testing often forget that tests, measurements, and/or assessments are the source of much of what we know about the individuality of students, their learning needs and interests, their particular abilities and accomplishments, and their promise for continued growth and development. Tests—standardized, commercially distributed, or teacher-made—are still the most acceptable means by which we learn what students have learned or achieved in six, nine, or eleven years of formal schooling. Assessment methods are now the best means by which we can learn if students have mastered basic or fundamental skills of literacy; to what extent they have developed the

academic competencies they will need to continue learning; and whether or not they have acquired the common core or fund of knowledge and information that many believe to be the foundation of education beyond the high school.

But even more important, formal and informal assessment is the means by which students learn more about themselves. From teachermade tests, students can learn what teachers, school, and society expect them to learn—and whether or not they have learned what is expected of them. From assessment, students can learn more about their interests and aspirations, their personal goals and objectives, the fields of study in which they excel or experience difficulty, the level of their general educational development, and their potential for professional and personal development. At least three generations of critics have underestimated the self-understanding that results from testing, measurement, and/or assessment; it is very much the baby in the bath water that they throw out.

To Assess is to Compare

The basis for all assessment is comparison with some recognized standard of performance, the state expectations of society or its institutions, some previously established record or mark of accomplishment, the past achievement of individuals, or the group performance of some meaningfully defined criterion or norm group. In brief, all assessment results are relative to some identified standard or expectation. In education there are no absolutes and unless we know what we mean by standards, norms, and criteria, we will never be able to assess with any acceptable degree of credibility and fidelity.

A confusion of the concepts: norms, standards, and criteria would seem to be at the bottom of our difficulties in defining educational or academic quality. Much too often the three terms are used interchangeably with the generous assumption that listeners and readers will know what is meant by such terms. The evolving usage of the three terms should lessen our confusion. Educational standards, whatever they might be, should be recognized as a stated or explicit expectation of performance or level of achievement. Norms, whatever they once were, are merely indices or measures of typical or representative behavior. Criteria are best regarded as the means by which we recognize that standards have been met; criteria are, in other words, the evidence we introduce as a means of showing that academic standards are in place and have been met.

It is most important to recognize that: (1) norms, standards, and criteria must be developed rather than discovered. This is merely another way of saying that they do not exist prior to their creation or their invention. Conventional criteria such as grade point averages (GPA) have evolved through usage and experience, but at some time in the past the GPA was the creation and/or development of some imaginative educator.

In much the same manner: (2) norms, standards, and criteria are seldom unitary. This merely means that there is no single best norm group, academic standard, or educational criteria by which to judge student performance, program effectiveness, or institutional impact; (3) norms, standard, and criteria are abstractions. Each must be operationally defined for particular students, programs, and institutions. Our operational definitions, however, must not be too strict and there must be some degree of generalization to other situations and conditions. Otherwise, norms, standards, and criteria would not have the construct validity that we have mentioned previously.

Finally, we should agree that: (4) norms, standards, and criteria for educational purposes should be educational in nature and consequence. It is necessary to say this because of the over-emphasis that has often been place upon economic, social, and political outcomes in postsecondary education.

To Assess Is To Interpret

The value of all assessment methods must be demostrated in their use and application. It is possible to construct and develop an assessment method well; to assess student

performance, program effectiveness, or institutional impact well; and then to invalidate the assessment process through the misinterpretation of assessment results. This has often been the case with the measurement of certain psychological characteristics such as intelligence, and it continues to be the case with measures of academic ability such as the SAT. Indeed, the SAT is an excellent example of an assessment method for verbal and mathematical abilities that is frequently undermined by faulty interpretation, use, or application.

Effective assessment thus is dependent upon: (a) the purpose for which the assessment is being conducted, (b) the suitability of the assessment method or technique for the learners involved, (c) the training and experience of those who are doing the assessing, and (d) the readiness of students, faculty, administrators, and policymakers to use the information gained from assessment.

With respect to assessment purposes it is necessary to say that all assessment should be explicit. The primary purpose of assessment should be to estimate, appraise, or otherwise determine the extent of student performance and competence in subjects and skills that they have been taught. When assessment methods are used for purposes such as the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, curricula innovations, institutional leadership, or the general condition of education, the purposes of such assessment should again be explicit and the particular methods adopted and/or developed should be appropriate.

The purposes of assessment should be determined by the educational objectives of programs and institutions. This is merely a restatement of the requirement that assessment results be educational in nature and consequence.

The interpretation of assessment results is an acquired skill and should be so recognized. All participants in an assessment process and all potential users of assessment results should be given training and/or assistance in interpreting assessment results for their particular purposes. Assessment results never speak for themselves, and like standardized test scores, no assessment result is self-interpreting.

As in the establishment of an institutional testing program, a system of faculty evaluation, or the changing of degree or graduation requirements, ample consideration should be given to preparing the proper climate under which assessment and evaluation will be conducted. Just as in the classroom, where there should be no "pop quizzes", there should be no "pop assessments" of student performance, teaching effectiveness, or institutional impact.

In brief, it should be obvious that the development and constructive use of suitable assessment methods in postsecondary education is a major challenge. We now have at our disposal numerous instruments, techniques, and procedures for assessing the various aspects of learning and teaching, but we are still in need of more systematic, objective, valid, reliable, creditable, and fair assessment methods.

From Assessment to Evaluation

The pressures for program and institutional evaluation stem from many of the same sources as those for assessment. Nonetheless, there are some particular reasons for our great concern with assessment in the 1980s. The beginning of our concern may be dated from the mid-1960s when federal funding policies placed a premium on educational evaluation by writing requirements into the legislation of that era. All of us are familiar with the story of the Equal Educational Opportunity study that was mandated by Congress, hurriedly conducted in order to meet congressional datelines, then greatly publicized despite its

misinterpretation of findings. The EEO study and its subsequent publicity, however, was most effective in turning public attention to studies of educational outcomes and impact. For colleges and universities, program evaluation became a management imperative and in the 1980s, program evaluation can be seen as a logical consequence of trends and events that took place earlier.

In the 1960s, it was obvious a new research specialty was emerging in the form of evaluation research. In 1967 Michael Scriven made his distinction between formative and summative evaluation, and in 1969 Ralph Tyler edited a volume for the National Society for the Study of Education that gave strong emphasis to new concepts, procedures, and instruments for educational evaluation. The early 1970s produced many volumes of evaluation research in which explicit recognition was given to: (1) the need for measurable outcomes that were carefully specified in advance, (2) feedback mechanisms that would permit adjustment or adaptations in academic programs, and (3) the overall improvement of academic programs, teaching effectiveness, and institutional viability.

Why Evaluate?

If we ask why our great concern for evaluation, we receive much the same answer that we did when we asked "Why Assess?". There is a need in the 1980s to reestablish the integrity and credibility of postsecondary education. A national concern for the quality for secondary schooling has shifted to postsecondary institutions and three national reports may be mentioned as indicative of public awareness that all is not well in academe (NIE, 1984; ACC, 1985; and NEH, 1985). Despite the abundance of professional and technical literature dealing with program evaluation, the evaluation of academic programs and the ensurance of academic quality pose many of the same problems as assessment. The primary purposes of evaluation are best identified as: (1) to describe, (2) to compare, and (3) to interpret. To describe institutional programs and performance with accuracy, we greatly need normative data that we often do not have. Despite the great emphasis placed by the federal government on uniform reporting standards, we continue to lack systematic, objective forms of information about comparable institutions, programs, and student populations. The comparisons of institutions and programs pose problems both similar to and different from the comparisons of student performances we make in psychological and educational measurement. Standards of institutional and program performance are especially absent. And the comparability of much institutional and program data is more often suspect than demonstrable. Nonetheless, there is much we can do to improve the evaluation of programs and institutions in postsecondary education and improvement should be our proper concern.

1. The evaluation of academic programs and projects and their impact upon institutional development should be an explicit responsibility of the institution itself. The use of outside consultants or evaluators should be only one component of the overall evaluation. No outside team or panel should be given the responsibility of evaluating institutional impact or effectiveness as such, but should confine its efforts to specific program effectiveness.

2. All evaluation efforts should be more explicit about the need for evaluation as a continuing, ongoing activity in postsecondary institutions. There still is a tendency to think of evaluation as a one-stop service that can be provided within a span of months or a single academic year. Such a view usually produces frantic scrambling to assemble an evaluation team and to have them review academic programs and projects. In the case of funded projects, there is specious scurrying in order to submit an evaluation report before the expiration of a grant or its thirty-day grace period.

3. Evaluation, irrespective of how quantitative or systematic the collection and

analysis of data may be, eventually boils down to a matter of human judgment. It becomes a matter of what competent and creditable observers say about the effectiveness of academic programs. The most significant statement that might be made, perhaps, is that program objectives are explicit and realistic—and that program results are in keeping with those objectives. No amount of statistical data or quantitative analysis can alter this basic form of this interpretation.

4. The effectiveness of evaluation is directly dependent upon the qualifications and competences of those who are doing the evaluation. For this reason, we seriously contend that it is as important to know who the evaluators are, as it is to know what it is they are evaluating. Because of this, serious consideration should be given as early as possible to the selection of evaluation teams or panels, and such teams or panels should be involved in the evaluation process as early as possible.

5. The indirect or deferred benefits of evaluation should be more explicitly recognized. Like planning, evaluation is a process and not a single event or result. To facilitate the indirect or deferred benefits of evaluation, those involved in the collection and analysis of evaluation data should know as soon as possible who members of an evaluating panel are going to be. This suggests that the purposes of evaluation are always, to some extent, specific and/or particular.

6. The question of institutional impact is not one that should be considered in most evaluation efforts. Academic programs and projects, when considered in relation to their explicit purposes, may be quite successful without giving visible evidence of institutional impact at the time of evaluation. Institutional impact is thus an outcome that should be evaluated separately in an entirely different manner.

7. The criteria of evaluation should be more explicit about the important functions of interviewing and observation during onsite visits. The importance of these skills emphasize the necessity of identifying early the members of evaluation teams or panels. Perhaps the evaluators' vitas should be presented as part of proposals for funded projects so that funding agencies can see exactly who will serve as evaluators on funded projects.

8. Evaluation criteria should also be more explicit about the nature of the evaluation report: to whom the report will be made; and the conditions under which the report will be submitted. It is often advisable that part of the evaluation report be in writing—and part of it be unwritten. In other words, there may be unpleasant news that should be communicated in confidence to presidents, deans, or department heads and not made a matter of record. The point to be made is that evaluation requires a relationship of trust and confidence in which evaluators can say uncomplimentary as well as complimentary things about programs and projects, and about the performance of professional staff.

9. The experience and expertise of evaluation teams or panels are, of course, paramount. The professional experiences of members should be diverse, but their expertise should be complementary. In other words, evaluation probably is not effective when all members of evaluation teams or panels think as one.

10. A better understanding of the role and responsibilities of evaluators should be worked out. If the evaluators are to serve as an intermediary between funding or governing agencies and a funded institution or program, this

should be explicitly stated from the beginning. Evaluation is not a service in which there should be conflicts of allegiance.

11. Lastly, the evaluation itself must be evaluated. A part of the general evaluation of academic programs and projects should always include some consideration and statement of the effectiveness of the evaluation itself and a statement of the institutional satisfaction with the performance of outside consultants and/or evaluators. In much the same manner, funding agencies and governing boards should clearly communicate their satisfaction, or lack thereof, to the evaluator. That communcation should be explicit enough to inform the evaluators how well they have served the evaluated institution, program, or project.

From Evaluation To Measurement

The preceeding discussion should suggest strongly that the effectiveness of institutional and program evaluation is very much dependent upon the development of effective assessment methods, techniques, and instruments. The methods developed may be formal or informal, nationally developed or institutionally-specific, and qualitative or quantitative, (i.e., they may deal with categorical data that are intensive/qualitative as opposed to continuous data that are extensive/quantitative). A diversity of approaches are permissable in the evaluation of academic programs, but all approaches must be supported by evidence that they: (1) have been well-thought-out; (2) encourage interpersonal agreement among knowledgeable observers and participants; (3) reflect educational purposes and concerns that are relevant to learning and teaching; (4) result in consistent or dependable findings and inferences; (5) meet the logical expectations of those affected; and (6) violate no one's sense of fairness. In other words, and obviously, methods that are systematic, objective, valid, reliable, credible, and fair.

Also important in the application of assessment methods in program evaluation are: (1) the development of a rationale that clearly states the purposes of evaluation, (2) the careful preparation of a climate or environment in which the evaluation of programs and personnel can take place, (3) a well-planned follow-through that will ensure the continued effectiveness of evaluative efforts. In particular, the purposes of assessment and evaluation should be carefully delineated from program objectives and institutional goals. Unless circumstances fully warrant other evaluation purposes, program evaluation should always be conducted with regard to the explicit purposes of the academic program or service. Another way of saying this is to reject notions of global, totalistic evaluation that tell us nothing about the effectivenss with which observed outcomes match expected outcomes of funded programs or projects. Programs objectives should be approved at the time that programs are authorized and/or funded; programs should then be evaluated in terms of how well they accomplish the purposes for which they were established.

To assess and evaluate student performance, academic programs and services, and institutional effectiveness in the manner considered here, many of us can see a returning emphasis on basic concepts and principles of measurement. The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB), in its 1981 report on "The Need for Quality" was the first educational agency to identify a national need to improve the quality of education at all levels. It was the first public commission to state unequivocally that we should implement minimum standards across the board and then surpass them. In its report, SREB further stated that current college admission standards were no demand for quality. In 1983 and 1984 a dozen prestigious national commissions, task forces, or panels were saying the same things.

In 1983 the chairman of SREB's Commission on Educational Quality, Governor Lamar Alexander of Tennessee, stated his conviction that the South should lead the

nation in "measuring education progress." Explicit in the expectations of public leaders was the use of educational achievement tests that would permit the comparison of student achievement in southern states with the performance of students nationally or in other states. In short, southern governors now wanted standardized test results that would demonstrate the comparative progress of education in their respective states.

To demonstrate in measureable terms the progress of education in southern states, senior exit or proficiency exams would be needed. More attention should be given to entry-level tests, and more states should follow the lead of Georgia and Florida in establishing statewide or systemwide testing programs at the conclusion of the sophomore year in college. It is all reminiscent of the testing programs developed at Georgia State in the early 1960s.

At that time Georgia State had the most comprehensive testing program of any institution in the nation. The objectives of that program were to provide assistance in: (1) selecting students with qualifications suitable for the various degree programs offered by the institution, (2) placing students with comparable ability in courses adapted to their level of academic achievement, (3) advising students about degree requirements, college regulations, and curriculum opportunities, (4) counseling students as to vocational and educational objectives, remediation of scholastic difficulties, and optimum use of their abilities and talents, (5) assessing the academic progress made by students at various stages of educational advancement, and (6) evaluating the effectiveness of academic programs offered and the utility of curriculum requirements. [Note: all terms above were the terms used to describe the program at that time.]

All entering freshman were required to take the:

1. College Board Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT)
2. Otis Quick-Scoring Test of Mental Ability
3. Cooperative General Achievement Tests (in social studies, natural science, and mathematics)
4. New Cooperative English Test: English Expression
5. Nelson-Denny Reading Test

At the "rising junior" level all students were required to take the:

1. Cooperative General Culture Tests (in social studies, literature, science, mathematics, and fine arts)
2. Cooperative English Expression Test

Graduating seniors in the College of Arts and Sciences took (at institutional expense) the:

1. Graduate Record Examination General Test (for verbal and mathematical abilities)
2. Graduate Record Examination Subject Test (in areas appropriate to the student's particular field of study)

It should be needless to add that GSU's testing program was expensive, time-consuming, and burdensome. It was also highly effective—and very useful in matters of program assessment and/or evaluation and institutional accreditation and advancement! It did have a bearing on academic programs and the education of students.

REFERENCES

Anderson, S. B., Ball, S., & Murphy, R. T. Encyclopedia of educational evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Cronback, L. J. Course improvement through evaluation. Teacher's College Record 1963, 64, 672-682.

Dressel, P. L. Handbook of academic evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Fincher, C. A description of the testing program at Georgia State College. Atlanta: Georgia State College Testing and Counseling Services, 1964.

Fincher, C. Standardized tests, group differences, and public policy. College Board Review, Spring 1977, No. 103.

Fincher, C. Program monitoring in higher education. New Directions for Program Evaluation, 1978, 3.

Fincher, C. Importance of criteria for institutional goals. New Directions for Institutional Research Series, 1978, 19.

Fincher, C. Using tests constructively in an era of controversy. College Board Review, Fall 1979, No. 113.

Fincher, C. The literature of program evaluation. Research in Higher Education, 1981, 14, 277-280.

Fincher, C. The standards of evaluation. Research in Higher Education, 1981, 15, 93-96.

Fincher, C. Ratios, rates, and ratiocination. Research in Higher Education, 1982, 17, 375-378.

Fincher, C. Norms, standards, and criteria. Research in Higher Education, 1984, 20, 499-502.

Fincher, C. Educational quality and measured outcomes. Research in Higher Education, 1984, 20, 79-382.

Fincher, C. For better or worse. Research in Higher Education, 1985, 23, 219-223.

Fincher, C. On comparing apples and oranges. Research in Higher Education, 1985, 23, 107-111.

Forrest, A. College outcome measures project: Progress report. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1977.

Gronlund, N. E. Measurement and evaluation in teaching. New York: MacMillan, 1977.

Mehrens, W. A., & Lehmann, I. J. Measurement and evaluation in education and psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.

Micek, S. S., & Arney, W. R. The higher education outcome measurement identification study. Boulder, Col.: National Center for Higher Education Systems, 1974.

Pace, C. R. (Ed.) Evaluating learning and teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Scriven, M. The methodology of evaluation. In R. W. Tyler, et al. Perspectives of curriculum evaluation. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.

Subcommittee on Academic Degree Program Assessment. Academic degree program assessment in the University System of Georgia: A tentative statement of rationale, purposes and procedures. Atlanta: Board of Regents of the University of Georgia, June, 1977.

Tyler, R. W. (Ed.). Educational evaluation: New roles, new means. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Thorndike, R. L. (Ed.). Educational measurement. Washington, D. C.: American Council of Education, 1971.

Undergraduate Assessment Program Council. Undergraduate assessment program guide. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

ASSESSING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Joe Marks
Southern Regional Education Board
Atlanta, Georgia

Over most of the history of American higher education, attending college was a privilege for those individuals who were believed to be destined to leadership roles in society—mainly the brightest among the affluent. Students progressed under the scrutiny of the faculty who monitored the course of study and were called upon to attest to the students' achievement, as signified by the award of grades and, ultimately, a degree. The assessment of student achievement was, in almost all cases, left to the faculty. The higher education community judged institutions' quality by their selectivity. The most selective institutions enrolled the most promising students, and it was assumed that those who graduated were necessarily the best educated; hence, from the best institutions.

The emergence of access as one of the primary goals of American higher education and the growing reliance of the American economy on a college educated workforce has made selectivity a less relevant indicator of quality. More and more, questions are being raised about the performance levels of todays' college students and graduates. In particular, our states' elected decision-makers are seeking ways to formalize the assessment of student achievement in the hope of providing an indicator of quality more relevant to the context of higher education today. Possibly in response to this new questioning, the South's regional accrediting association has taken the significant step of including, in its revised standards, criteria that require higher education institutions to document the achievement of their institutional goals—efforts certainly to entail increased assessment of student achievement.

A Model for Analyzing Assessment Practices

There are three major areas of student achievement that are subject to assessment: intellectual development, career development, and personal development (Figure 1). From an educational standpoint, the primary area of achievement is intellectual development. What basic skills have students mastered? What levels of academic attainment have students reached in general and in specialized knowledge? What special aptitudes have students developed?

The second and third areas in which student achievement is assessed are career and personal development. What levels of career aptitudes and awareness have students acquired? How many years of education do students finally complete? What are students' vocational achievements, such as level of responsibility, income, awards and special recognition? The personal development area covers self-concept, attitudes, beliefs, and value systems. How prepared for life and how suited for citizenship have students become?

In addition to there being different areas of student achievement which are subject to assessment, there is the question of which stage, or stages, of student development are subject to assessment. There are assessments which measure aptitudes and achievements of first-time students, those which mark progress made by continuing students during the college-going period, and those which measure graduating students' achievement. Assessment results might be comparable among states and institutions or they may be one-of-a-kind, with no

Figure 1

AREAS, LEVELS, AND INSTRUMENTS OF STUDENT ASSESSMENT
SREB STATES

Levels of Development	Areas of Development: INTELLECTUAL	CAREER	PERSONAL
GRADUATING STUDENTS	GRE LSAT MCAT NTE	CIRP SOIS	CIRP SOIS ESS
CONTINUING STUDENTS (Soph/Jun)	COMP NTE PEP PPST	Aptitude & Career Guidance Tests	CIRP ESS SOIS
FIRST-TIME STUDENTS	ACT APP CLEP SAT	Aptitude & Career Guidance Tests	CIRP ESS SOIS SAT & ACT Profiles

KEY: Graduate Record Exams (GRE); Law School Aptitude Test (LSAT); Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP); Student Outcomes Information Services (SOIS); Medical College Admission Test (MCAT); Evaluation Survey Service (ESS); National Teacher Examination (NTE); College Outcomes Measurement Program (COMP); Proficiencies Examination Program (PEP); Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST); American College Test (ACT); Advanced Placement Program (APP); College Level Examination Program (CLEP); Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT).

SOURCE: Southern Regional Education Board. Measuring Educational Progress in the South: Student Achievement (Atlanta, Georgia: SREB, 1984).

comparability to others. In addition, assessment might be required or conducted on a systemwide basis or employed by institutions on a discretionary basis.

Assessment Practices in the SREB States

The most widely practiced assessments are of first-time college students' intellectual development. Nearly all Southern colleges and universities require first-time students to submit Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or American College Test (ACT) scores. These do not measure what students learn in college, but indicate academic aptitudes and prior achievement. Scores are used to evaluate prospective students for admission and to aid in academic placement. While perhaps less of a factor in admissions today, these tests are increasingly looked at to reveal the educational preparation of college-bound students. Some SREB states use these "entrance exam" results on a statewide basis. For example, SAT freshman norms are distributed throughout the University System of Georgia and, in a "high school feedback" program, each high school receives a status report, including SAT and early course performance information, about its former students.

Many states also require the Test of Standard Written English (TWSE), and the California Achievement Test's (CAT) math section for students who score below a certain level on the ACT or SAT. Another widely practiced assessment is evaluation of first-time students to determine if they should be awarded college credit for knowledge already attained (e.g., College Level Examination Program—CLEP). The Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) is widely used to evaluate foreign students for admission and academic placement.

Beginning mid-1984, Florida implemented common placement tests and testing procedures to assess the basic computation and communication skills of all students entering college. Cut-off scores determine which students require remediation. The University System of Georgia developed,many years ago, a basic skills testing program for this purpose.

In addition to these types of requirements, several states are looking into or are requiring first-time students to have completed a minimum number of prescribed secondary units for college entry.

More and more assessment of student progress in college is being conducted for entrance to teacher education, nursing, and other specialized programs. Most employ comparable testing instruments, such as portions of the National Teacher Examinations (NTE), the College Outcomes Measurement Program (COMP), the Proficiencies Examination Program (PEP), the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST), and the California Achievement Tests (CAT). Five of the Southern states—Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas—now require entrance exams other than SAT or ACT for students pursuing a teacher education degree. Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, and Virginia use SAT or ACT scores with grade point average to determine eligibility. Noncomparable assessments are used as well. In Kentucky, the State Board of Education, which regulates teacher certification, requires basic skills tests for admission to teacher education programs. Individual institutions select their own instruments and determine minimum scores.

A widely noted type of student achievement assessment is the "rising junior" test. Florida and Georgia have received national attention for being among the first states to develop such assessments. The Florida "rising junior" test—College Level Academic Skills Test (CLAST)—assesses continuing students' communication and computation skills. The test is based on faculty consensus about the skills appropriate for all students moving to the junior level. Over time, the score required to qualify students to be eligible to receive an associate degree or to be given upper-division standing is being raised. The requirement applies to transfer students as well, and this academic year students enrolled in Florida's independent institutions must participate if they receive state financial aid.

Georgia's Regents' Testing Program, also considered a "rising junior" test, is intended to assure that all graduating students have certain minimum skills in reading and writing. Reports on student performance and comparisons between institutions are distributed for planning purposes. Remedial courses are available—or required for students who have 75 hours of degree credit and have not passed.

Rising junior tests are essentially minimum competency examinations intended to ensure a certain level of achievement for all college students. Like the high school minimum competency graduation tests, they do not measure "high quality." In fact, one widespread concern about the use of minimum competency tests is the worry that minimum competency may become maximum expectation.

Tennessee is the only Southern state with a statewide program to assess all graduating students. They administer the College Outcomes Measurement Program (COMP) to a sample of four-year college graduates.

At least half of the SREB states assess graduates of specialized programs. Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia use the National Teachers Examinations (NTE) for graduates seeking teacher certification. Virtually all the other states use teacher certification tests of some kind. While the passing score varies from state to state, in general it is set at a very low level—far below the national norms (if any) on the tests; the idea is, again, to assure minimum competency.

Other assessments of graduating students include the widespread use of the Graduate Record Exam (GRE) or the Miller Analogies Test (MAT) for students seeking entrance to graduate school. Some undergraduate departments are experimenting with the GRE as a requirement for all their graduating students, with both locally and externally developed senior exams, with peer evaluations, or with COMP.

The growing importance of student assessment is illustrated by the fact that some states—Alabama, Florida, Georgia (and Tennessee in 1986)—are using certification test passing rates for graduates of teacher education programs to make decisions about continuing state approval of the programs. State higher education agencies have also used nurse licensing examinations in making decisions about whether to continue state approval for nursing programs. With the growing interest in student performance, more attention to the results of these important examnations is expected.

Concern for the areas of career and personal development results almost exclusively from institutional initiative. SAT and ACT profiles—which include student background information as well as test scores—are widely used. Standardized aptitude and career guidance tests are used, sometimes as part of the admissions process. Counseling and guidance centers have a broad variety of tests available. Follow-up studies are also conducted widely to assess the career development of graduates; though few of these follow-ups are system-wide or employ comparable questionnaires.

Conclusions

The assessment of student achievement in higher education is less extensive than in elementary and secondary education. The suggestion of putting a greater emphasis on assessment has even raised an outcry in some higher education circles. Yet, even now, higher education assessments of student achievement are the basis of important decisions affecting institutions, students, and society at large. Decisions such as who will attend which institutions of higher learning, who will be allowed to prepare for specific professions, who will be certified in the professions—and in some cases—who will be allowed to receive college degrees, and which institutions will receive extra funding or state approval for certain programs. Today there is interest in a new form of accountability for higher education—accountability on the basis of the

demonstrated achievement of students, not just on financial criteria; and quality judgments on the basis of student academic success, not just on the basis of selectivity.

Most formal assessments of student achievement at the collegiate level still occur at the college admissions stage. True college-level assessment of students serves special categories of students, such as those seeking credit for knowledge already acquired (CLEP), or entrance into specific programs (NTE or GRE); serves a "gate keeping" function aimed at certifying minimum academic accomplishment, e.g., certfication tests for graduates seeking to teach, or "rising junior" tests for college sophomores; serves as a basis for the evaluation of specific programs, e.g., teacher education or nursing, or for decisions about state approval or authorization; and, at a more or less experimental level, to monitor improvements in student performance and educational progress.

ASSESSING EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES

Thomas E. R. Redmon
Southern Regional Education Board
Atlanta, Georgia

It is difficult to be pessimistic about the ultimate outcomes of education at any level in the United States after one reviews the recommendations and rhetoric of some two dozen national reports on current and future plans to improve the opportunities to learn and the commitments to teach in our colleges and schools. And yet, the disarray of the current moment is evident enough to pursuade most parents, students, and teachers not to view education as their sole source of personal and career development. Indeed, if the nation's investment in education were situated in stocks and bonds, there could be no doubt that the bears would be in control and that the general climate of education would represent the near bottom in a depression that began not too many years ago.

The Definition of Assessment

Assessment appears to be not only a useful term in the education dictionary but also our only way out of an otherwise unmeasurable decline in the benefits of this most treasured American entitlement. Recently, the term has gained credibility, highlighted by an October meeting of educators responsible for assessment in Columbia, South Carolina, sponsored by the American Council on Education. Whatever gain may be realized from this nation's climb out of a depressive educational era appears to be linked closely with the effective use of assessment as a tool to measure our future progress.

Traditionally, assessment has been used to make reference to any number of measurable scales of progress. The measurable progress might be related to achievement or to some other structural improvement or change in institutions or in state responsibility for education.

Two examples come to mind as the most widely used assessment activities of current interest to institutional decision makers. First, the increasing use of tests of academic performance is reaching an all-time high on college campuses. These tests of academic ability are used at the admissions level all the way through "exit" levels from the sophomore or senior year of college. Perhaps the tradition of classroom evaluation lies at the heart of this increasing use of performance measurement. Certainly the concept of testing students on their achievement and ability does not require extensive explanation or defense in faculty senates or other campus decision groups. Our abiding faith in objective (and now essay) testing contributes to this long-standing, traditional method of assessment.

The use of such tests requires a number of important decisions about the choice of an institutionally developed instrument or the application (and perhaps modification) of a generally available commercial product. Regardless of the choice, conscientious administrators and faculty have learned what it takes for such testing to produce useful outcomes. A brief review of such experience indicates a number of requirements for any assessment by way of objective or essay testing of academic performance:

1. Clear purposes regarding the overall use of tests for particular application as well as the choice of a particular instrument to measure defined achievement or ability.

2. Clear question specifications allowing the matching of measures to expected outcomes.

3. Comprehensiveness of the instrument to adequately measure ability or achievement in the areas of concern.

4. Explicit connections to classroom settings, instructional method and course structure.

5. An informed decision regarding the choice of essay and/or objective items as the forms of evaluation.

6. Clear directions students will understand without lengthy explanation.

7. A well-articulated policy relating the outcome of test scores to overall evaluation by grades.

8. Opportunities to evaluate the test according to the difficulty of items on the instrument as well as the validity of the instrument for the purpose defined.

Although many of these requirements are taken into consideration at most campuses, assessment is not always consistent and the use of such requirements becomes burdensome in many settings of evaluation.

Additional concern also should be focused on at least three areas of validity of such instruments:

Construct validity (making sure the idea of using a test fits the circumstances for evaluating academic outcomes)

Content validity (making sure that the evaluation instrument chosen or created fits the specific instructional and curriculum setting within which students are to be evaluated)

Predictive validity (making sure that the test will serve the purpose of certifying preparation for the next step of education in a specific setting)

A second typical area of assessment that has evolved to judge the effectiveness of college may be found in many assessments of student satisfaction with college. Although the evaluation typically is administered in the form of a survey (with an infinite variety of such instruments used at hundreds of colleges across the nation), the primary purpose of such an effort is to ascertain the level of satisfaction students have with their undergraduate experience. The quality of such assessment generally depends upon the sophistication of the survey research design and the expected use of the outcomes of the survey. Beal and Noel (1979) found in a follow-up study of student satisfaction with their undergraduate experience significant factors relating to the retention of students. Their findings suggest the value of such assessment and its impact on institutions with significant retention problems. Specifically, this example of assessment yielded five major negative factors which students find to be unsatisfactory.

1. Inadequate academic advising

2. Inadequate curricular offerings

3. Conflict between class schedule and job

4. Inadequate financial aid

5. Inadequate counselling support systems

6. Inadequate extracurricular offerings

Conversely, the study also found certain factors to be positively related to students' satisfaction with their undergraduate experience.

1. Caring attitude of faculty and staff

2. High quality of teaching

3. Adequate financial aid

4. Student involvement in campus life

5. High quality of advising

Regardless of whether institutions use these two examples of assessment or other

traditional forms of measuring student satisfaction and ability, there appears to be great comfort taken in simply doing the testing or administering the survey. The real value (and difficulty) of such assessment is in the ability of a college or state system of higher education to effectively incorporate those outcomes into the provision of the best possible educational services to students.

While many authors assume that the outcomes of education are related directly to measurable scales on tests or other evaluation instruments, this paper will suggest the larger definition of an educational outcome as a goal related to the overall purpose of education in any specific setting. For state and institutional policymakers, the definition of an educational outcome as a measurable statement of a goal yet to be accomplished provides two important foundations for research and policymaking:

1. The outcome of a particular educational activity may be perceived as a clear statement of what ought to be;

2. The definition of outcomes as specific, measurable goals may allow for any number of evaluation or testing techniques to be used to determine if progress is underway or if the outcome has been achieved.

Such a definition allows outcomes to be used more directly to formulate educational policy and to make use of more than one specific indicator of progress or attainment. Further, this view allows educational outcomes to be studied with respect to their costs and benefits to individuals and institutions and to the society that supports them. As Howard Bowen (1977) has cautioned, educators can make a significant mistake "by assuming that improved outcomes are desirable regardless of cost . . . In assessing the efficiency of higher education, . . . one must consider both cost and result." (p. 21)

Planning For Desired Outcomes

Descriptive research on higher education yields a wealth of data on the effects of education. Such research, based on time-proven evaluations, will continue to give the public and its policymaking representatives handholds on educational improvement efforts. But the effects of education often have little to do with the desired outcomes embodied in state plans and institutional missions. As a comprehensive example of the kind of outcomes that education should yield, the Southern Regional Education Board's recommendations through its Commission on Educational Quality are worth careful review.

In 1985, the SREB Commission published 50 specific goals in three important areas of educational reform:

1. Providing access to quality undergraduate education

2. Improving teacher education in colleges and schools

3. Setting academic standards for secondary vocational education

These three areas of educational reform not only organize useful groups of educational outcomes but appear (on the basis of recent responses) to provide direction for educational activities in the most critical (depressed) arenas of educational quality.

Undergraduate Education

For several decades, American higher education has found itself in the spotlight of educational reform. Since the Truman Commission on Higher Education and the Harvard "redbook", countless institutional, state, and federal reports have called for moderate to dramatic tinkering with what had become known as undergraduate general education. The current spate of reports offered to various audiences to confirm that rigorous

self study is underway continues that tradition of appraisal from within and without. The SREB goals call for specific actions, or if you will, outcomes, in key problem areas.

> Setting standards for college-level academic performance. (Including specific recommendations on entry-level standards and indicators of satisfactory progress throughout the undergraduate course of study)
>
> Making college remedial programs accessible to students. (Including recommendations regarding both the geographical and financial accessibility of college preparatory study)
>
> Preparing students for college. (Including strongly worded recommendations for increased cooperation between high schools and colleges, and the development of explicit measurements of adequate preparation for college-level work)
>
> Strengthening the college curriculum. (Specifying goals for content reform in undergraduate curriculum and underlining the importance of faculty cooperation in reform activities)
>
> Preparing faculty for teaching undergraduate studies. (Highlighting the importance of faculty attitudes and skills related to teaching undergraduates during the first two years of college work)

Teacher Education

The Commission Report on Improving Teacher Education included a large number of goals related to four major agendas for higher education and the schools:

> Recruitment of talented students. (including concerns for adequate academic preparation of students and appropriate incentives to attract students into education for the teaching profession)
>
> The content and structure of professional education. (Twelve of the goals in this report focused on the program structure, the content of study and the practical experience that form the substance of professional education for teachers)
>
> Institutional support. (Including goals on making teacher education improvement a priority agenda item for presidents and chancellors, increasing institutional support for faculty in colleges of education, and advocating increased contact between professional teacher educators and public school administration and teaching)
>
> State support. (Including concern for public support for teaching, state executive support and increased legislative funding for teacher education programs)

Vocational Education

The Commission's Report on Improving Education included goals in two major areas:

> Maintaining quality and raising academic standards. (The goals included concern for restructuring the linkage between vocational and academic education, course design, basic skills assessment and remediation, and the important relationship between practical experience and academic learning)
>
> Experimenting with new models. (The recommendations suggested the formation of state task forces to encourage pilot projects to improve secondary vocational education, increasing attention to evaluation, joint enrollment opportunities, upgrading the use of technology in vocational education, and exploring new structures of cooperative education)

Planning and Controlling Outcomes

As in any organizational system, there is no reason to spend scarce resources on outcomes that do not help fulfill the goals of the organization. Underneath the interest in higher education institutions for calm, neutral research, colleges and states want something good to happen to the students who enroll. Much of that good can be found in the above statements of goals with which institutions will become committed in various ways over the next decade. This paper will conclude with a call for concern not so much for the inevitable choices of desired outcomes but for increasing commitment to plan for and control those outcomes in order that they will, in fact, occur.

In the October 1985 ACE meeting on assessment in Columbia, South Carolina, Professor John Harris of David Lipscomb College presented an excellent overview of assessment. He introduced his presentation through a letter to Dr. Dubious Scholarius, Dean of the Faculty and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Everyone University, Oxbridge, U.S.A. In his contrived letter, he recognized Dr. Scholarius' skepticism about "the whole outcomes business", but went on to assure the Dean of how important his interest in this area can be to the mission of Everyone University.

In John Harris' closing paragraphs, we find reassurance for the Dean at Everyone and a bit of advice:

> As you move into assessment at Everyone, I suggest you find someone to observe and comment on the organizational development implications of what you want to do. My point is this: An emphasis on assessment will affect the way everyone functions as an organization. You not only need help in the technical side of assessment but also in the nurturing of a climate characterized by:
>
> 1. Deep concern for "results" over "form."
> 2. Commitment to high standards.
> 3. Concommitant interest in helping students reach the standards.
>
> In the last analysis an emphasis on assessment is more of an attitude than a collection of tests. (p. 53)

Harris' advice to the Dean should be well taken. All of the technical improvement possible in test making and administration will not necessarily result in the outcomes of education that we all might expect or hope to have happen. Taking the time to plan for the outcomes we expect will add enormously to the success of whatever evaluation or assessment colleges undertake to move closer toward their overall goals.

Although planning models are widely available in written as well as software form, such effort often is wasted because of the lack of control over the actions and efforts to bring about desired outcomes. Institutions oftentimes create elaborate, sophisticated plans on paper without effective management controls to bring about results.

As institutions and states undertake plans for assessment that will yield useful outcomes, certain requirements of control are necessary:

1. A rational, organized approach to planning and to the choice of desired outcomes is essential to any accomplishment expected.

2. Clear documented decisions on what to control will assist planning and will aid in the accomplishment of the goals and objectives institutions and states set for themselves. These decisions should represent consensus on what is viewed as critical in the accomplishment of the outcome and what forecasts trouble in the movement toward that goal.

3. The senior management team at an institution or in a state must decide on the method of control that will be used to guide and encourage progress toward the desired outcomes. Such decisions

are especially important in higher education where individuals are used to some degree of anonymity and creative participation rather than routine line responsibility.

4. The management team must also decide when to control efforts toward setting goals and choosing assessments. These decisions can effectively stifle or encourage the accomplishment of outcomes at both the institutional and state level. In education the decision to control is in many ways a matter of timing.

5. Progress toward outcomes must itself be measured in order that all participants may see clearly that their efforts are leading toward desired outcomes.

In view of the increasing sophistication and availability of high quality assessment instruments, the importance of planning and control cannot be underestimated. Outcomes such as those in the areas described above are not attained easily by even the most coherent software analysis package. Time and effort afforded to planning and control cannot help but improve the attitude of "assessors" and "assessees" but even more practically, such an emphasis may ensure that assessment is worth its cost.

REFERENCES

Beal, P. E. and Noel, L. What works in student retention: A preliminary summary of a national survey. Iowa City: ACT/NCHEMS, 1979.

Bowen, Howard R. Investment in learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Harris, John. Assessing outcomes in higher education: Practical suggestions for getting started. Paper presented at the National Conference on Assessment in Higher Education, 1985.

Southern Regional Education Board. Access to quality undergraduate education: A report to the SREB by its Commission for Educational Quality. Atlanta: SREB, 1985.

Southern Regional Education Board. 10 recommendations for improving secondary vocational education. Atlanta: SREB, 1985.

Southern Regional Education Board. Improving teacher education: An agenda for higher education and the schools. Atlanta: SREB, 1985.

ASSESSING VOCATIONAL COMPETENCIES

Michael T. McCord
Athens Technical Education Center
(formerly Assistant Professor
Institute of Higher Education
The University of Georgia)

The concept of assessment would seem to be particularly suited to vocational education. First usage of the word did not emerge from an educational classroom. However, the meaning of this term began with an important idea for educators of all areas (Loacker, Cromwell, & O'Brien, 1985). From the late Latin, ad + sedere, the term came to mean sitting down beside someone or sitting down together. In early usage, an assessor was one who sat down beside or shared another person's position. The idea of a person sharing with another knowledge and skills essential to performance has long been at the heart of vocational education. The majority of vocational instructors possess occupational experience and are certified as skilled professionals within the area they have been asked to "share" (teach) with students, young and old, who desire work in that area. The vocational instructor is one who has been in another person's position in business and industry and is now sharing that knowledge and experience by sitting down with another.

As the language has evolved and words changed to take on differing meanings, the word 'assessment' and the label of assessor have taken on monetary connotations. The focus of the term has come to be on determining the worth or value of something, usually in dollars and cents or time, gold, precious items, etc. Yet it has not left the idea that there has to be a skilled or expert judgment made to determine worth after some careful observation.

As this paper was prepared, observations were made of the instruction and the organizational structure supporting post-secondary vocational education. An impressive array of complex subjects and means for teaching them was discovered. Equally impressive and somewhat perplexing was the complexity of the testing and/or evaluation reflected in the variety of instruction encountered. As a former teacher educator, my curiosity was aroused as to the educational background and experience required for certification and licensing in vocational education. I was especially interested in how such a wide variety of skills in this instruction would be standardized and taught through the teacher preparatory institutions. Upon examining the Teacher Certification in Georgia handbook, I was pleased to find a special set of certification requirements for the post-secondary only V certificate series.

Basic to becoming a vocational instructor is being licensed by the professional board or association which sets the standards for the field. Included in the licensing process is the requirement of passing the NOCTI exam appropriate to each area and the TPAI (Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument) which is especially designed to assess teaching skills. NOCTI is the acronym for National Occupational Competency Testing Institute, a nonprofit organization devoted to developing and validating tests for determining occupational competency at different levels. In Georgia, there are over 30 of these tests approved at the post-secondary level as one measure of occupational competency.

Also found was a listing of courses available at the state's teacher preparatory institutions which covered desirable subjects recommended for certification. Much to my dismay, there was only one course at only one institution which dealt in depth with the topic of testing and measurement techniques appropriately applied to vocational education.

This does not mean that vocational instructors do not receive a course in test and measurement principles. It does, however, support a contention I shall pursue in this paper that vocational instructors are receiving an overemphasis on the use of a type of measurement technique which alone is not appropriate for assessing vocational competencies. Why do I consider this important? A conclusion of this paper is that the key element involved in assessing vocational competencies resides in the assessment competency of the vocational instructor. For vocational education to assure the possession of vocational competencies by it graduates, the process of assessment must become intimately intertwined with teaching to the point of being considered a special technique of instruction. One implication of this conclusion is that teacher trainers must recognize the special nature of acquiring vocational competencies and no longer be satisfied to have the traditional means of tests and measurement techniques thrust upon vocational teachers as the "standard" for assessment.

This paper has the following major purposes:

1) Examine some of the basics of assessment and briefly review techniques of assessment as they apply to vocational competencies,
2) Present the pros and cons of conducting assessment activities in an attempt to spark dialogue among professionals, and
3) Give consideration to critical questions and accompanying tasks which may lead to the recommendation and recognition of standards for vocational competencies which would support advances in the state of the art and use of assessment techniques in vocational education.

Why assessment of vocational competencies?

Wentling (1980) has compared the vocational educator's means of justifying his work to the sales technique employed by a huckster of a cure- all medicine. The huckster will swear by his product, will give many examples of its success and produce testimony from someone in the audience. However, there is usually some question as to how widely this product is being used and what percentage of the users the success cases represent. In some cases; the honesty of the salesperson becomes questionable.

If broadly considered, this analogy is applicable to most educators. . . . . instructors and administrators (probably a higher proportion of the latter). Instruction is considered to be very relevant, very reliable and effective. Instances of successful former students are known and readily displayed as are statistics of job placement resulting from a follow-up study (usually short term). Yet, educators share a common consternation when asked to produce solid evidence as to the success of individual courses and programs.

The production and use of a process for competency assessment can facilitate communication of program successes to the appropriate audiences. This time of year one appropriate audience that readily comes to mind is the legislature. School boards and advisory boards would also be better informed and reassured of accurate information. Within the institution, administrators and faculty could better communicate. Even potential students would be impressed with proper techniques for assessing competency. Of course, the results would yield to the employer an accurate picture of the perspective employee possessing the traits desired.

An additional impetus to develop a better process for assessing vocational competencies emerges from several recent activities in the state. This year the establishment of a State Board of Post-Secondary Vocational Education has resulted in the production of an Evaluation, Planning and Budgeting Model by which area institutions must conduct long range planning. This model will provide a statewide coordination of resources and means by which each institution will engage in program evaluation activities. As a part of the program evaluation activities, there will be

an assessment of instructional activities. This is a beginning for assessing vocational competencies.

The focus of competency assessment in vocational education.

The term "vocational competency" is almost as broad a term as student achievement or educational outcome. Just as with these terms, it is critical to define clearly what you are talking about before you try to set about assessing it. It is important to define the term carefully so that it may be of utility for practical purposes of developing assessment. Just as classifying behavior is critical to successful observation in traditional academic institutions, within vocational education it is important to classify behavior.

The same domains which Bloom et. al. (1956) have formulated for educational achievement behavior also apply to vocational education. The cognitive domain includes the most basic levels of thinking, recalling of facts as well as more complex levels such as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation in vocational instruction as well as in traditional academic instruction. Another major type of student learning that is critical for vocational competency is the interest and attitudinal area which comes under the affective domain. This is very much what employers classify as being task oriented or committed to work activities. Perhaps the domain which holds the most pertinence and relevance to the assessment competency of vocational education is the performance domain. This is made up of two sub-domains which are psychomotor domain (Simpson, 1966) and perceptual domain (Moore, 1970). The combination of these two sub-domains relates to doing physical tasks with the use of muscle movement and a sense for input.

These three domains should provide vocational educators a means of looking at the job task as well as classifying vocational competency. The domains do help identify individual types of competencies in learning. It should be emphasized that they are independent. But, their value should never be prioritized because in vocational settings it may be crucial that an attitudinal value is just as important as a performance value. Most performance skills require knowledge and an affective component for their successful completion. For instance, a welder must be aware of proper temperatures to use. He must use those proper temperatures to complete his work successfully but if he does not possess good safety attitudes, he may not perform adequately at all.

Within vocational education, assessment must also be considered from an additional perspective rather than just domains of behavior and learning. Assessment should also be considered from a point of reference; particularly the two references called norm and criterion. While undergoing instruction and training in vocational skills, it may be useful to compare a student's performance to that of another student which is norm referenced testing. It is critical that the major emphasis for the development of competency in vocational education be placed upon the student reaching criteria of performance.

While traditional schemes of grading using standardized test and performance competition are utilized in the instruction that occurs in vocational education, this should not be the predominant mode of assuring competency on the part of the student. Norm referenced testing seems to be useful if selection of the most qualified student is important or if there is a need to determine how an individual or group compares to others when performing a certain task. However, when it comes to the assurance that a student possesses a certain vocational competence, then, another student's evaluation has little to do with the performance of one student. This should be related to a predetermined behavior, a standard or criterion of performance which employers are expecting new employees to exhibit.

Brief view of techniques for assessment.

Many ways exist to assess learning as it occurs within vocational programs. To attempt this would go beyond the scope of this paper. For a more detailed coverage, publications by Erickson and Wentling (1976), Cross

(1973), and Bloom, Hastings, and Madaus (1971) are referenced. First, let us consider the assessment of performance since it is an activity in which all vocational educators have participated. Prior to formal education, the performance of apprentices was assessed by master craftsmen. In turn, today, vocational instructors have been certified in their profession. They assess student performance by many means, sometimes intertwining the assessment spontaneously with instruction. Almost always, performance is assessed by first observing and then evaluating the process or the product of the act that is being performed. Providing feedback to the student usually regards the quality or the nature of their act.

There are three basic types of assessment used for performance. There is 1) some type of identification test, 2) a simulator or work sample, and finally 3) the employer's survey. Since the employer's survey is least likely to be readily available to the instructor as they are teaching, I'll expound briefly upon the first two. The identification test is the most basic type of performance test. It measures an individual's capabilities using knowledge and sensory input to identify materials, tools, equipment, components, and other job related items. This can be as basic as asking students to identify wood samples or as complex as asking students to identify auto parts, their wear or deficiency, the cause of the deficiency and the recommendation for repair.

The second major type of performance test includes the simulation and work sample tests. When a work sample test is employed, there is the administration of a control test under the actual conditions of the work situation. Usually the students are required to use the same procedures that would be employed on the job. Simulation tests, however, are designed to replicate the work situation by using specialized equipment or making modification in existing equipment and imagine they were on the job. In many vocational educational laboratories a project method of instruction uses a form of the work sample test. In this situation, a one-to-one relationship exists between examiner and student. The content of work sample and simulation tests can vary from very simple, immediate reactions to very complex tasks such as those used in a medical laboratory.

The category that is probably second of importance to use in vocational education is that of affective behavior. Affective competency can be categorized into four areas for assessment purposes: interests, attitudes, values and appreciations (Tyler, 1973). Assessment in each of these catagories is difficult for several reasons. The technology for testing the affective domain is somewhat primitive, especially when compared to the technology for testing and measurement in the performance and cognitive domain. It is also very difficult to measure the impact of instruction on affective behavior, because the effect of instruction is often long term, possibly not being exhibited for months or years after instruction. By exhibiting pride, the vocational instructor may be teaching pride in work. This is not measured or observed until a student has entered the world of work and had the opportunity to exhibit pride which was observed and acquired.

While these difficulties are recognized, they should not be an excuse for failure to attempt assessing competencies. Instead they should be considered a challenge and provide a goal for advancing competency assessment within the affective domain. As an example, within all vocational programs there is a content area of safety which should be taken as a common area for which standards of affective behavior can be established and therefore assessed. This may establish a model for assessing other affective competencies in vocational education.

There are other ways of assessing affective competencies. There are generalized and direct observations by the instructors, interviews, questionnaires, inventories, projection techniques and unobstrusive measures, all of which have been employed to assess various aspects of the affective domain. However, in vocational education we do not seek to go into the depth of one's personality to measure affective competency. Therefore, direct observation is usually appropriate. This

involves recording while viewing a student's behavior following a stimulus. An example is the nursing student's reaction to a patient's criticism which can be observed and judged as assessment of interpersonal skills.

Probably the domain which has received the most attention in vocational programs is the assessment of cognitive competencies. The reason for this is primarily due to the fact that performance objectives and test items stated as cognitive skills are easier to prepare than for other domains. It is also predominantly the traditional means by which achievement has been judged. Consequently, procedures and techniques for assessing cognitive skills are the most highly developed and emphasized. If vocational education is to reassure employers that vocational competencies desired have been taught, surely it is necessary for assessment procedures to have evaluated the student for more than just cognitive achievement. This is not to discourage the use of cognitive tests, it is merely pointing out that instructors should not be bound by the tradition of putting importance on the use of cognitive tests more than those of performance or affective competencies within vocational education.

Pros and cons of assessing vocational competencies.

Initially, it would appear that the most important advantage in assessing vocational competencies is to assure the employer of what he is acquiring in a student who graduates from a vocational institution. However, I would argue that this is further down the line of important reasons. In my opinion, it would appear that the most important reason for assessing vocational competencies and having a process which does assess vocational competencies is to enable the improvement of instruction. This is to benefit student and teacher interaction. If students failed to become competent, in most cases there has been some flaw in the instructional process. If emphasis is given to the assessment process, the instructor becomes attuned when weaknesses develop. This provision of feedback to teachers about areas of instruction needing further emphasis can provide a major means for continually upgrading instruction. Thus, assessment results can enhance instruction. When results are returned to students, it can be demonstrated to the student that their competency is growing or that their learning is progressing. For those students who are not progressing, a knowledge of assessment results can be a basis to establish additional or further study.

Another advantage of using an assessment process to establish competency is that it insures quality control of instruction over time. When standardized achievement measures are used by the instructor year round, the results of instruments can be compared across the classes to determine if instruction is consistent. On the other hand, when criterion referenced measures are employed, there is a constant flow to the student of strengths and weaknesses. Thus, a constant recognition by the teacher of where the student needs to upgrade. This is one area which could be of greatest benefit: establish criterion reference testing procedures for teachers to utilize in assessing vocational competency. Levels of competency could be established. Rather than comparing to other students or norms, there would be identifying levels of competency.

Of course, consideration must be given to what are some of the disadvantages of assessing competencies. One of the first and probably the most obvious (and available as an excuse), is that by establishing criteria to which students must strive instructors may limit their teaching to the content or the proverbial "teaching to the test." If the test is based upon the content needed, that may not be so terrible; however, it may have another effect of "minimal" instructors teaching to the minimum criteria. Another disadvantage is related to the underdevelopment of assessment technology. Compared to procedures used in the physical sciences, the measurement of learning, in general, is in its infancy because it lacks the precision that can be attained in the physical sciences. As already mentioned, probably the assessment of cognitive learning is the most advanced of all assessment techniques. But assessment of

affective and performance behavior is crucial to vocational education. One of the reasons cognitive achievement is so readily utilized in vocational instruction is there are a number of available standardized tests which have undergone extensive revision.

Another drawback is the time assessment procedures can consume. If vocational competency is to be assessed correctly, it is going to require both student time and instructor time interacting in ways which may displace some traditional instructional activity. There will be a need for the instructor to document the assessment process and this will require the preparation of recording the assessment procedure. Another and probably final disadvantage of assessment relates to its focus. If we focus too strongly in assessment on the learning that takes place, then too much emphasis will be on achievement and not on instruction. It would be crucial for assessment procedures to not only indicate when low achievement occurs but for the supervisor to be able to identify the reason for the problems.

Regardless of the disadvantages, the pros for assessing competencies outweigh the cons. Recognition of shortcomings should provide impetus for devising ways of minimizing their effects in the assessment of vocational competency.

Critical questions about assessing competencies in vocational education.

There are several questions involved in the process of designing assessment procedures for vocational competencies. Along with each question an activity is necessitated to produce an answer and establish the credibility of that answer. The first question has to be (Q1) what should be the competencies acquired? There are several means to ascertain the answer to this question, but in order for the answers to be considered credible, there must be an accompanying task of (T1) assessing the validity (appropriate and adequate) of identified competencies. Upon the student's completion of the program of study, (Q2) what were the competencies actually acquired? Here standardized tests can give us information of the acquired knowledge. In order to really ascertain whether or not we have done a good job of measuring the acquired competencies, there must be the task of (T2) testing the validity of measurement techniques with interviews, observations, simulations, and the use made of test results during the student tenure in the program of study. The next question is (Q3) how well did the instruction work? The accompanying activity on task is (T3) assessing the instructional training process as it was planned and as it was actually executed.

The above three questions relate to the acquisition of the competency and to what happens within the local institution. However, there is still a question of (Q4) do the graduates apply their competencies? This necessitates an accompanying task of assessing the extent of competency application in actual job/occupational performance situations. Even then, it cannot be assumed that we are finished with the student. We must go on to ask the question of (Q5) how long the competency lasts? This necessitates the accompanying task of (T5) assessing the endurance of competency in performance situations. That is followed by the even more broad question of (Q6) what is the socioeconomic impact? This brings to the task not only (T6) assessing the benefits associated with vocational competency but the cost. Any time we seek the socioeconomic benefit, we must take into account what it cost to produce those benefits. Thus, there has to be some means of ongoing cost capturing procedures. At the same time, there must be follow-up study of long term impact associated with the student's career. The final question brings us back to identifying competencies in the first place. Just a bit prior to asking that question is another. . . (Q7) which competencies do we need most? The accompanying task is one of (T7) prioritizing vocational education efforts in terms of the relative value of competencies to the public. If the market is flooded, if the technology is changing such that our production of agricultural engineers or technicians or welders or machine shop specialists is no longer highly

valued, then there must be a change in priorities to de-emphasize these and to emphasize other skills that have come into existence.

A point which needs to be considered in determining an answer to what is the socio-economic impact goes beyond the definition of program success and examines multi-dimensional indicators of the worth of curricular content. Judgment of the worth of a program should embrace such matters as 1) congruence with an individual's career objectives, 2) differences in learning style, 3) non-vocational purposes, 4) psychological satisfaction, 5) influence on eventual educational attainment, 6) short and long term economic benefits to the individual, 7) social efficiencies in work place, 8) ability to fulfill the aspirations of persons with special needs, e.g. a physical handicap, and 9) the basic cost effectiveness (Grasso and Shea, 1979).

Conclusion and recommendation.

The assessment of vocational competency is a complex task. It will require a complex approach but it should be a straightforward approach beginning at the top level. The establishment this year of a State Board of Post-Secondary Vocational Education is the beginning of an autonomy and authority which will allow the development of assessment particularly suited to vocational education. The guidance necessary for local institutions has begun in the form of an evaluation, planning and budgeting model (State Board of Post-Secondary Education, 1985). This model contains two phases of program assessment. The first is based upon enrollment, graduates and placement. The second involves a higher degree of student evaluation, employer evaluation, assessment of program facilities, assessment of the equipment and instructional materials, assessment of the instructional process and assessment of business support. The Board is to be commended for taking fast and accurate actions in a direction that will prove beneficial to the effective development of vocational education at the post-secondary level in the state of Georgia.

There does exist a need for establishing standards by which efforts to measure vocational competencies should seem to measure what they purport to measure; that is, they should have face validity. Within psychometric circles, face validity is often accused of having a detrimental impact because it arouses a response set of faking tendencies. However, within vocational education if a measure does not have substantial face validity to the instructor and to the employer, then it will not receive credibility. Given the basic politics and purposes of assessing vocational competency, face validity is necessary for assessment to be taken seriously. . . even if on pyschometric grounds it is not sufficient.

A second standard is that vocational competency assessment must have a generic component applicable to different levels across different fields. While the previous standard encourages assessment procedures that are individually suited for each field, this standard establishes the necessity of bringing together some convergence, consistency, or uniform quality that can be expected of all graduates from vocational education institutions. Here again the State Board is to be commended. The work of the Standards Committee (1986) has already recognized two categories of program standards, those which apply specific occupational programs and generic standards which apply to all programs. Under the definition of generic standards this committee has indicated components should be the basic skills of communication, computational, and employability skills, each of which should include pertinent computer literacy skills.

A third standard for the measure of vocational competency is that they should be based on criteria that are public. Thus, different evaluators will make approximately the same assessment of the same student's performance. What is referred to here is the necessity that criteria be established on which observers can agree but at the same time should also be very explicit and should be known in advance. Students should have access to the criteria towards which they are

developing. When these criteria are public, then the assessment can be questioned by students and defended by faculty in a straightforward fashion that dampens any suspicions of favoritism or futility.

A fourth standard is that measures should have educational validity. The assessment procedure should be able to demonstrate that students at the end of the program will score higher than themselves or other students when beginning the program. While this seems obvious, it is often neglected and treated casually in practice. It implies several things, one of which is that there will be a careful coordination between curriculum design and the assessment of competence. This standard would emphasize an importance of criterion referenced rather than standardized testing. This would mean that most traditional measures of ability are not very useful as a comprehensive measure of vocational competency.

The fifth standard that I would impose upon assessment of vocational competence is that they should be demonstrably relevant to performance after graduation. Here the issue is not so much as to whether the assessment is relevant but the basis for claiming relevancy and the kind of evidence brought forward to back up the claim. Accompanying these recommended standards should be activities to support assessment in the form of systematic attempts to advance a technology of assessing vocational competency. I understand currently a test bank is being developed for all vocational/occupational areas by the VTEC program with the cooperation of the Southern Association. While this is commendable, inherent within these standards is the recommendation that assessment procedures in vocational programs be extended and go beyond cognitive learning. An implication would be that vocational instructors will need to expand their knowledge of performance and affective assessment techniques through formal and informal staff development activity.

A final recommendation is that there be an emphasis on using a variety of techniques to supplement the assessment of competency beyond the student's tenure. Evaluative techniques such as a long term follow-up study, employer surveys and advisory committees as evaluating teams should be utilized. The results of these assessment efforts should be used to facilitate the understanding and correction of program deficiencies on the part of instructors and administrators.

In closing, I would assert that the development and definition of assessment has preceded along lines through history to a point where for vocational educators it means more than ever a sitting down together with the learner to assure the acquisition of skills for a bright future filled with opportunity.

REFERENCES

Bloom, B. S. et.al. A taxonomy of educational objectives: The cognitive domain. New York: David McKay, 1956.

Bloom, B. S., Hastings, J. T. and Madaus, G. F. Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Cross, A. A. Home economics evaluation. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1973.

Erickson, R. C. and Wentling, T. L. Measuring student growth: Techniques and procedures for occupational education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976.

Grasso, J. T. and Shea, J. R. Vocational education and training: Impact on youth. Berkeley: The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1979.

Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S. and Masia, B. A. A taxonomy of educational objectives: The affective domain. New York: David McKay, 1964.

Loacker, G., Cromwell, L., and O'Brien, K. Assessment in higher education: To serve the learner. A paper prepared for

the Conference on Assessment in Higher Education at the University of South Carolina, Columbia, October 13-15, 1985.

Moore, M. R. The perceptual-motor domain and a proposed taxonomy of perception. A V Communication Review, 1970.

Simpson, E. J. The classification of educational objectives: Pyschomotor domain. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1966.

Standards Committee "White Paper" on standards: purpose and background. State Board of Post-Secondary Vocational Education Meeting, January 9, 1986.

State Board of Post-Secondary Vocational Education. Evaluation, planning, budgeting model: Program assessment component. Suite 601, South Tower, Omni Complex, Atlanta, GA, 1985.

Tyler, R. W. Assessing educational achievement in the affective domain. East Lansing, Michigan: The National Council on Measurement in Education, Spring, 1973.

Wentling, T. L. The assessment of learning: A base for instructional evaluation. In A. A. Cross (ed.), Vocational Instruction. Arlington, Virginia: The American Vocational Association, Inc., 1980.

STATEWIDE NEEDS ASSESSMENT FOR HEALTH PERSONNEL

Libby V. Morris
Institute of Higher Education
The University of Georgia

I am pleased to be able to present to you this afternoon an overview of the "Statewide Needs Assessment for Health Personnel" currently being conducted by Dr. Cameron Fincher and myself at the Institute of Higher Education. This study is funded by the Georgia Student Finance Authority, the agency which awards the service cancelable loans to students in the health professions. First, I would like to give a very broad and general description of the health care delivery system in the United States and Georgia, and then I would like to touch upon the major points of this study within that context.

Health care in the United States is a major business and a national concern. In 1982 health care expenditures totaled 322.4 billion and comprised 10.5 percent of the gross national product. The average cost that year for health care was $1365 per person. During the 1960s and 70s, jobs in doctors' and dentists' offices more than doubled; having climbed to 1.5 million in 1982. At the same time hospital employment tripled growing by 5.1 percent per year to three million jobs. Even in 1979-82, when total employment was virtually unchanged, employment in health occupations continued to grow.

This tremendous growth was the result of many factors. Private medical insurance increased to cover greater numbers of people. The federal government in 1965 introduced Medicare and Medicaid to reach the indigent, disabled and elderly. Technological advances soared creating job openings for previously unheard of technicians and technologists.

During the 1960s and 70s, accompanying this growth in employment and technology was an expansion of facilities. In 1873 there were 178 hospitals in the United States. In 1980 that number had grown to over 7000 hospitals nationwide. In Georgia alone in 1983 there were 191 general hospitals with 33,468 beds and over one million admissions. Added to this extensive delivery system was Georgia's 326 nursing homes with 33,730 beds with a 94.0 percent occupancy rate.

These impressive growth statistics represent a technologically advanced system of health care with equally startling health care costs. Consequently, there has ensued a lively debate and mixed reactions as to how to contain health care costs and deliver health care services. Several of the reactions to contain health care costs are as follows:

1. Prospective Reimbursement Plan

   The prospective reimbursement plan is the federal government's plan for holding Medicare costs down by reimbursing hospitals at a fixed rate for 468 defined diagnostic groupings.

2. Health Maintenance Organizations (HMO)

   HMOs are designed to control costs and to emphasize good health habits. HMOs contract with an enrolled population for physician and hospital services at a fixed, prepaid rate. Metro Atlanta has six HMOs with an estimated 180,000 members.

3. Preferred Provider Organizations (PPO)

   PPOs are one of the newest concepts to control health care costs. In PPOs, a large business contracts with certain doctors and hospitals to provide health care service to its employees at a reduced fee for service. The fees may be as much as 15-20 percent below the usual and customary charge.

Some of the delivery system changes have included the entry of "for-profit" hospitals

owned by national chains, and the establishment of birthing centers, mobile diagnostic units, home health care agencies and freestanding emergency centers.

In one year, 1982, freestanding emergency centers increased from 260 to 600, and the National Association of Freestanding Emergency Centers (NAFEC) currently estimates 1800 such centers. It is predicted that there will be 4500 by 1990. Atlanta currently has 23 centers, all privately owned and for profit.

The newest market in health care, however, is in outpatient services. In 1983 Georgia had 70 home health agencies serving all 159 counties with services ranging from professional health care such as physical therapy to housekeeping aid. A drive along any major street will reflect the proliferation of durable medical goods and services in the home health care market.

This brief description of the medical marketplace is not to imply that the proliferation of services has reached every corner of Georgia or that competition has spurred sharp declines in health care costs. For example, "less than 10 percent of Georgia's physicians practice in non-metropolitan areas." Additionally, there are 14 counties in Georgia where the primary care providers do not accept Medicare or Medicaid. Also, in 1984 health care expenditures climbed to 366 billion dollars, surpassing defense, education, food and beverage, consumer goods, financial institutions and agriculture.

These descriptions are illustrative but not exhaustive of changes in the health care system in the 1980s; yet, as a result of these and other measures, hospital stays are shorter and utilization is down. Last year, one in three hospital beds was vacant at any one time, and as a result, hospitals cut 73,000 employees from their staffs. The questions then are: How will these changes in the marketplace affect our future supply and demand of health care professionals? How is it impacting on the current supply and demand of professionals? What do these changes mean to our educational system--its applicants, enrollments, its growth or demise in certain areas?

While changes were occurring in the delivery end of health care, changes were also happening in the supply end of education. Nursing supply can serve as one brief example. The number of registered nurses actively practicing quadrupled between 1950 and 1980 from 335,000 to 1.2 million. During that time, training programs shifted in type and location: college and university programs at the baccalaureate level grew from 195 to 368. Associate degree programs grew from 18 in 1955-56 to 707 programs in 1980-81. The traditional training programs for nurses, the hospital-based diploma programs, decreased from 967 to 311 in 1980-81.

As can be seen from the foregoing description, the health field is changing, and at the center of this change are the educational programs, the patients, and the health care professionals. For without patients, there is no demand for health care services, and without an educated and ready supply of professionals, expressed demand cannot be met.

It is the study of supply and demand in Georgia that is being conducted by the Institute of Higher Education. The objectives of the study are as follows:

1. to survey the educational and training programs for health professionals in Georgia–their growth, availability and productivity;

2. to inventory the traditional and emerging sites of employment for health professionals in Georgia;

3. to assess Georgia's current supply and overall need for professionally trained personnel in the health care field;

4. to project the future supply and future demand for health care professionals in Georgia;

5. to assess how supply and demand might be brought into balance through assistance to students through service cancelable loans;

6. to make recommendations concerning the education of health related personnel and the way in which public resources might better be used to improve health care in Georgia.

This study began in the Fall of 1985 and will be completed Fall, 1986. Under consideration are approximately 25 careers including dentistry, nursing, pharmacy, respiratory therapy, occupational and physical therapy, surgical technology and podiatry, to name a few.

Rather than describe manpower methodologies and instrumentation for this study, I would like to review the study by addressing its three major components: supply, demand and projections of future supply and demand.

Supply

Supply can be defined in many ways but generally refers to the actual head count of persons actively working in a field. Supply can be influenced by a number of variables that are difficult to measure: inmigration (i.e., the number of eligible workers moving into the state); outmigration (i.e., the number of eligible workers leaving the state); part-time workers; cross-over workers (i.e., health care workers of one occupational type performing the service of another occupational type); licensure status for an occupation; the educational systems' output in the form of students and graduates; and the demographics of the current supply.

To address the problem of establishing the current supply in Georgia, it is possible to go to a number of sources, but as will be quickly seen, each data source has its problems.

1. State Examining Boards

The state examining boards regulate the practice of certain occupations in Georgia through an examination and licensure process. Thirteen of the occupations under consideration are regulated through those boards with biennial requirements for re-licensure. The problem with this measure of supply can be stated by the phrase "once licensed, always licensed." The State Boards do not regularly, if at all, collect information on the practice status or location of those persons holding licenses. As a result, the supply according to licensure status is greatly overstated in most cases.

2. Educational Programs

Educational and training programs are, of course, the major source of supply. To determine the number added to the potential supply each year by the educational programs, all of the training programs in the state will be surveyed as to their program's productivity (i.e., capacity, number of applicants by program, number accepted, number enrolled, number graduated). The schools will also be surveyed for plans of reduction, expansion, elimination or addition of programs.

For the University System, this process will be more easily accomplished by referring to the data on programs and students at the Board of Regents. More difficulty attends securing the same information from the many private colleges, proprietary schools, vocational-technical schools, and hospital programs in Georgia. For example, there are currently 14 hospitals in Georgia offering one or more health professions programs accredited by the American Medical Association's Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation. There are also other programs in Georgia not accredited by a recognized accrediting body, but these programs, too, add to the supply. Developing a comprehensive list of who teaches what, where, to whom in Georgia is not a simple task.

3. National and State Professional Associations

Supply may also be addressed through contact with the national and state professional associations. Those older, more traditional, occupations have stronger professional associations with more current and reliable data on programs and students. The newer occupations often have very short training periods, multiple unaccredited programs and very little data. Even with the older professional associations, supply is usually addressed according to educational supply rather than working supply. As we all know, everyone educated in an occupation does not choose to work in that occupation. For example, some authoritites in nursing estimate a 30 percent attrition from that field.

Since many of the occupations included in this study are classified as Allied Health, and are relatively new on the health scene, even less is known about their graduates, attrition, employment and productivity. In fact, sixteen of the twenty-four occupational areas for which the Committee on Allied Health Education and Accreditation (CAHEA) accredits programs have been added since 1968.

4. State and Federal Agencies

Lastly, for supply estimates the state and federal agencies may be consulted. One may turn to the Georgia Department of Labor, although that agency has not been funded since 1982 to conduct specific "manpower" studies by occupation. One may also go to the Federal Bureau of Health Professions and consult their reports which, of course, have a considerable time lag in their data. The State Health Planning Agency also may be contacted for information on facilities and distribution of high technology equipment; however, personnel distribution, especially in allied health, (i.e., workforce studies) is not a major priority for that agency.

In summary, overall provider to population supply in Georgia is not easily determined, and it becomes even more complicated when problems of geographic maldistribution, institutional maldistribution of personnel and areas of shortages are added to the concerns being addressed. Even with these problems, supply can and must be established to enable our educational programs and funding agencies to have the information they need to make sound decisions about resource allocation.

Demand

Demand refers to those health care services a population requires, uses, and/or is willing to pay for over time. Demand can be assessed by such measures as manpower to population ratios, need-based figures, demand-based figures or professional judgment estimates. Many factors, once the methodological approach is selected, then act on demand: the age of the population; the income and educational level of the target population; environmental conditions and the accessibility of health services. In Georgia, we find_that in urban counties, 13.6 percent of the population fall below the federally-defined poverty level. In rural areas, the percentage is significantly higher at 22.3 percent. The economic difference in the population affects demand in rural versus urban counties. "Need" may be the same, but the economics of poverty create a different "demand" for services.

To determine demand as defined by employment, a survey will be made of Georgia's health care employment opportunities. Included in the survey will be all of the state's nursing homes, hospitals, home health agencies, public health services, and private offices, clinics and laboratories. One of the larger tasks is to identify all of the users or employers of health personnel.

The employment survey will seek to identify current levels of employment, vacancies, turnover rates and the plans for addition

and deletion of health services. This information will be combined with data collected from several annual surveys such as the Joint Annual Hospital Survey and the Ambulatory Surgical Services Questionnaire. Establishing demand is crucial to any workforce study, for educating individuals in jobs that are oversupplied and in decline is too costly in federal and state dollars, too costly in university and college resources and too costly in human time.

Future Supply and Demand

The third area of concern is the future supply and demand of health care proffessionals. The future supply and demand will be established by considering several variables: current trends in supply and demand, current and projected population data for the state, technological advances and changes and the profile of Georgia's future.

Between 1980 and 1984, Georgia was the third fastest growing state in the nation and over half of that growth was attributed to inmigration. Between 1980 and 2000, Georgia is predicted to add two million more people to its population. Currently, over 10 percent of Georgia's population is over 65, and that percent is expected to increase rapidly as Georgia becomes the second fastest growing retirement state in the South. This projected growth in the population in Georgia along with its concurrent aging will make new demands on Georgia's health care system and its educational programs.

If Georgia is to meet the health care requirements of its citizens in the future, it must know where it stands today, where it wishes to go in the future, and how she will get there. We hope this study will provide answers to some of those questions and will be of help on the way to the future.

REFERENCES

American Hospital Association. Hospital statistics. Chicago: American Hospital Association, 1983.

Bachtel, D.C., ed. The Georgia county guide. Athens: Cooperative Extension Service, The University of Georgia, 1985.

Boberg, J.T. and Hendrick, H.L., eds. Allied health education directory. Chicago: American Medical Association, Department of Allied Health Education and Accreditation, 1985.

Filerman, G.L. Socioeconomic trends and strategic planning for health services education. Educational Record, 1985, 65, 4-5.

Georgia: 2000 Committee. Georgia: 2000, Future growth and human and natural resources. Atlanta: Georgia: 2000 Committee, 1986.

Goldman, Allan. Home health agencies in Georgia: An updated review and analysis with recommendations. Atlanta: State Health Planning Agency, 1984.

Klarman, H.B. Economic aspects of projecting requirements for health manpower. Journal of Human Resources, 1969, 4, 360.

McGuire, C.H., Foley, R.P., Gorr, Alan, Richards, R.W., et al., eds. Handbook of health professions education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Melville, Keith, ed. The soaring cost of health care. Dayton: Domestic Policy Association, 1984.

Morris, Joyce, Georgia Department of Labor. Personal interview, December 1985.

Neuhauser, Duncan. Technological innovations: Revolutionizing information management and decision making. in C.H. McGuire, et al., eds. Handbook of health professions education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

North Central Georgia Health Systems Agency. Primary care component plan, 1984-1989. Atlanta: North Central Georgia Health Systems Agency, 1985.

Personick, Valerie. The job outlook through 1995. Monthly Labor Review, 1983, 106, 24-35.

Seabrook, Charles. Empty beds at hospitals push up health care costs. The Atlanta Journal and Constitution, Nov. 3, 1985, p. 14-A.

Silvestri, G.T., Lukasiewicz, J.M., and Einstein, M.E. Occupational employment projections through 1995. Monthly Labor Review, 1983, 106, 37-49.

Vosburgh, Whitney. American industries: Which are the biggest? Athens Banner-Herald/Daily News, Jan. 11, 1986.

Wright, J.S., Gaede, O.F., and Lick, D.W. Health and demographic characteristics of Georgia: Rural/urban and north/south. Journal of the Medical Association of Georgia, 1985, 74, 552.

United States Department of Health and Human Service. Health: United States, and prevention profile. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1983.

ASSESSING THE NEW STANDARDS FOR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION AND COLLEGE ADMISSIONS

Nathaniel Pugh, Jr.
Assistant to the President
Georgia Southern College

Introduction

Good afternoon, it's an honor to share with you my thoughts on assessment of high school graduation requirements and new college admissions standards.

There is a concern in the nation by the public with the quality of education received by students who graduate from our public high schools and the academic preparedness of our youth who are being admitted to state universities and colleges.

In 1976 [1], Peter W. brought action against a San Francisco school district in the Superior Court claiming negligence and intentional misrepresentation which deprived him of basic academic skills. He alleged he was able to read at only the fifth grade level when he graduated, and this was not adequate to enable him to enter the world of work. Two years later [2] a student brought action against a New York school district to recover $5,000,000.00 damages for his academic deficiencies. He claimed he was permitted to graduate although he had failed several subjects and lacked basic reading and writing skills.

While these suits were not successful for the plaintiffs, the accusations of poor public school performance were well reported by the media. Public schools are being asked by the public to account for the quality of their products. Thus, the significance of graduation requirements come into focus. Graduation, as the capstone of secondary education logically should reflect some central priorities of schooling.

At a public hearing on excellence in education [3], Dr. Gary Jones cited some rather interesting data regarding the academic preparedness of American youth who are being admitted to our postsecondary institutions, he stated:

> A study done at the University of California found that between 1977 and 1980 only half of 50,000 students could demonstrate reading and writing skills necessary for college level courses. At Kent State University, 25 percent of entering freshmen left school after two years of below average work.
>
> Georgia's 33 institutions of higher education spent more than six million dollars in 1981 on remedial training. At Ohio State University, 42 percent of entering freshmen in 1981 were required to take at least one remedial course in English or mathematics. Ohio's total remedial bill in 1981 was in excess of 10 million dollars.

One-half of City University of New York's 170,000 students required special help and remedial education at a cost of 33 million dollars annually.

You will note that this problem is not confined to any one region of the United States. Many observers feel the problem lies with a decade-long decline in postsecondary standards. Rather than engage in the overused technique of "pointing the finger" at the the other sectors of education, namely, secondary and presecondary, I believe and support the second recommendation of the National Commission on Excellence in Education's report, "A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform", that stated:

> "We recommend that schools, colleges, and universities adopt more rigorous and measurable standards, and higher

> expectations for academic performance and student conduct, and that four-year colleges and universities raise their requirements for admission. This will help students do their best educationally with challenging materials in an environment that supports learning and authentic accomplishment." (1983, p. 27)

Assessing The New Standards For High School Graduation

Until about 1976, the two standards mandated for high school graduation were attendance and credit requirements in a variety of specified and unspecified courses.

Beginning in the mid-seventies, the use of an additional or new standard was imposed by states for high school graduation to assess academic performance based upon verified competencies.

Two of the three standards for high school graduation that have been reviewed recently in the literature are credit and course requirements and the level of academic performance.

A national survey [4] of states revealed a wide variance in the number of credits required for graduation. For example, four states had no requirements; one state required only a one-semester course in government; and one state required only one year of study in history/government. One state required 16 units, but did not specify the units. Most states required credit in the areas of English, mathematics, and science. The modes for these subject areas were: English, 25 states required more than three units; mathematics, 23 states required one unit; and science, 27 states required one unit. Eighteen states reported that changes in graduation requirements were under consideration. Twenty-one states indicated that minimum competency tests were required for graduation. Many local boards of education have imposed the minimum competency test requirements without state mandate.

The graduation requirements in the State of Georgia mandates attendance, earn at least 21 Carnegie units of credit, with a total of 13 Carnegie units that must be taken in the core curriculum; English language arts 4, mathematics 2, science 2, social studies 3, American studies area 1, health, safety and physical education 1, computer technology and/or fine arts and/or vocational education and locally required or elective units 8, and passing the Georgia High School Basic Skills tests. The high school graduation requirements in the State of Georgia are consistent with most states.

The major policy issues that will be used to assess high school graduation requirements are: legal, psychometric and educational.

The Legal Issues

The implementation of Florida's Educational Accountability Act of 1976 resulted in a class action suit that has become a precedent setting case known as Debra P. v. Turlington [5]. The suit alleged that the testing program violated the Fourteenth Amendment on four counts, namely that: (1) the test was culturally biased, (2) implementation of the program denied diplomas without sufficient notice in time to prepare for the examination, and (3) the testing program was a device for resegregating Florida's public schools since those failing the test were placed in remedial classes that tended to contain more blacks than whites, (4) the test may have covered matters not taught in the schools of the State.

In our own State of Georgia, students filed a suite known as Wells v. Banks, to enjoin the Tattnall County School District from imposing the minimum competency test as a prerequisite for graduation. The Georgia Court of Appeals upheld the school district's right to promulgate policy reasonably related to the state's interest in educating youth [6].

Following this lawsuit in another case in Tattnall County, Anderson v. Banks, a Georgia court ruled that the diploma policy, per se, did not violate the Fourteenth Amendment on the basis of racial

discrimination. However, considering the past de jure history of a segregated system, and an unfair tracking system which perpetuated it, the discriminatory impact of the policy did violate the plaintiff's constitutional rights. However, the diploma policy cannot be constitutionally imposed on those who attended classes in the dual system.

A review of the literature on legal issues and the use of minimum competency tests to satisfy graduation requirements indicate that there are five major legal problems that states and local school districts could face; they are: educational malpractice, racial discrimination, adequate prior notice, the match between the test and instruction, and the psychometric properties of the tests.

Psychometric Issues

Minimum competency tests used by most states have established standards of performance that use criterion-referenced tests. Criterion-referenced means that the student's performance is measured by his or her mastery of certain skills or subject matter rather than by comparison with the performance of other students taking the same or comparable tests.

The setting of standards for mandated minimal competency requirements is one of the more important and controversial problems confronting the entire educational community, and it has special salience for measurement specialists.

A standard often is assumed to have been established and then is used as the starting point to determine whether an examinee should be classified above or below the standard. With some exceptions [7,8] little attention has been directed to the questions of where the standards come from, who established them, and what procedures are used to set them.

The procedure used to establish the cutoff scores or standards for the Georgia High School Basic Skills Test was a modified Angoff/Nedelsky procedure. The modification was recommended by Jaeger of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

In the literature five models are used as methods to establish standards of performance for minimum competency tests. The models are: judgmental, combinational, empirical, bayesian and decision theoretic. There are seven major procedures that comprise judgmental models (Nedelsky, modified Nedelskly, Angoff, modified Angoff, Ebel and Jaeger).

These five major procedures that are used to set standards of performance are described as continuum rather than state models. The basic difference between these models has to do with the underlying assumption made about ability. Continuum models view ability as continuously distributed attributes with upper and lower boundaries and an individual's performance established at some point on a continuum. State models view abilities as an all or none proposition, either you can do something or you cannot.

For minimum competency tests standards are set arbitrarily and without some regard for consequences that could have the potential to do great harm. Therefore, the denial of a high school diploma because a student fails to reach the cutoff point of an examination not only labels the person as a failure but may eliminate many job opportunities for which the poor test performance is irrelevant. Holding back a student because of poor test performance, or on any other basis, must be judged in terms of the likely consequences.

Educational Issues

Given this issue, I am concerned with fairness, validity and the relationship between increased graduation requirements and academic performance.

In judging the fairness of minimum competency testing to assess the standard of performance for graduation requirements, the match between the test and what is actually taught is of particular importance. It is my belief that fairness requires that a school's

curriculum and instruction be matched in some way with whatever is later measured by the test. The test would be unfair if it measured what the school never taught.

McClung [9,10] suggested that traditional notions of content validity should be expanded to include the concept of "instructional validity". In other words, the validity of a minimum competency test should be established in part by examining the relationship between test items and instruction actually received by students. If a test measures outcomes never taught in school, it may violate substantial due process because the school rather than the students is at fault and the students are being punished without being personally guilty.

Curriculum validity is a measure of how well test items represent the objectives of curriculum to which the test-takers have been exposed. Even if the curriculum objectives for the school correspond with the competency test objectives, there must be some measure of whether or not the school district's stated objectives were translated into topics actually taught in the district's classrooms. If test items do not reflect actual content of instruction, then the competency test should not be used as a high school graduation requirement for individual students.

Ferratier and Helmick [11] report that:

> . . . . .there is no evidence that increasing graduation requirements affects student academic performance. In fact, there is some evidence to the contrary. State of Illinois and national data show that there is a weak or inconsistent relationship between graduation requirements and student achievement. This is a most disturbing finding since it is counter to most conventional wisdom. Nationally [12], there is evidence that school districts with higher achievement have fewer graduation requirements, while districts with lower achievement levels tend to use higher education requirements, probably in an effort to raise achievement.

Assessing College Admissions Standards

The concern for the increasing number of underprepared students now entering college and the precipitous increase in the numbers of students involved in remediation at the college level have prompted national studies and actions by individual states to address the problem. Some states have enacted legislation or adopted state policies requiring institutions and state agencies to raise admission standards.

In the last five years, six surveys of admission standards at public colleges and universities have been published [13,14,15,16,17, 18.] Four of the surveys are national in scope; two are for states in the South or West.

The most recent national survey was conducted by the College Board [18] in 1986. This survey revealed that twenty-six states have no statewide admission standards and twenty-four states reported having statewide minimum admission standards. In thirteen of these states the institutions of higher education are not allowed to exceed state requirements, while eleven states allow individual institutions the authority to impose more stringent admission standards.

What kinds of new statewide admission standards are being used? In 1984-85, nine states required only that in-state students entering public colleges and universities have a high school diploma or its equivalent. Of these nine states, seven (Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Wyoming) did not allow individual institutions to impose additional requirements, making these state systems, in effect, open admission systems. Two states (Kentucky and Ohio) permit their institutions the opportunity to impose stricter standards.

Eight states require entering freshmen to present satisfactory scores on college admission tests. Test scores are the only requirement for admission to Mississippi's public university system. Applicants to

public universities and colleges in Florida must present a minimum high school GPA as well as satisfactory test scores; while students in Arizona, Georgia, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, and West Virginia can be admitted on the basis of their GPA's or another criterion, such as class rank or predicted performance, if their test scores are below the minimum required.

In addition to Mississippi, seven states use only one criterion for admission. The single criterion used by these states are: minimum GPA (Nevada and Maryland), class rank (Iowa), high school coursework requirements (New Jersey and Wisconsin), and a sliding scale model (Massachusetts and California).

Current regular admission standards for in-state students to be a member institution of the University System of Georgia are a minimum GPA on academic work of 1.8 or a 250 verbal SAT score or a 280 quantitative SAT score. Entering freshmen scoring below 330 on the verbal SAT or below 330 on the qualitative SAT will be given the Regents Basic Skills examination to determine whether developmental studies shall be required prior to entry into regular college-credit courses. Specific institutions of the system may require higher levels of performance requirements and/or additional testing.

The University System of Georgia is one of eleven statewide systems that have established statewide minimum standards with institutional discretion. Others are Arizona, Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, Ohio, West Virginia and Wisconsin. The type of statewide admission standard in use in the State of Georgia as of 1984-1985 was a minimum GPA or test scores. Only five other states beside Georgia use this type of statewide admission standard; they are Arizona, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, and West Virginia.

In light of extensive discussion about the inadequate academic preparation of students entering college today, it is interesting to note that only five states (California, Florida, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and Wisconsin) required a prescribed pattern of high school coursework as an entrance requirement for their public colleges and universitites in 1984-85. The University System of Georgia will join these ranks in the fall of 1988. Four more states (Illinois, Kansas, Ohio, and Montana) recommended a minimum curriculum for entering freshmen. Twelve states, however, are moving to either recommend or require the adoption of high school curriculum standards.

What are the trends in the new admission standards or policies? During the period 1982-1985, sixteen states have enacted or are proposing more stringent statewide admission standards. Ten states reported no anticipated changes in their admission standards. Two of these states (Kansas and North Dakota) chose to retain their open admission policies after careful study.

In the sixteen states making changes, the new or proposed standards involve either imposing fourteen states or strengthening two states a prescribed pattern of high school coursework for entering freshmen. Two of these states also recently raised the minimum test scores (Florida) and minimum grade point average (Oregon) required for admission, and two states (Arizona and Idaho) will require students to complete their prescribed high school courses with a minimum GPA of 2.0.

Statewide admission models most frequently incorporate three major criteria: high school rank, high school grade point average, and a standardized test score. In addition these criteria can be used to develop two additional methods for admission; they are the sliding scale and predicted performance models. Breland [19] developed five statewide admissions models and he assessed their impacts upon three racial groups.

Table 1

SUMMARY TABLE FOR FIVE MODELS
OF STATEWIDE ADMISSIONS POLICIES

Models/Minimum	Percentage Eligible by Group[1]			Differential Impact	
	Blacks	Hispanics	Whites	Blacks	Hispanics
1. Single Index					
Rank in top 2/5	56	64	71	12	7
GPA - 2.75	52	65	72	20	7
SAT - 800	27	43	73	48	30
2. Multiple Index					
Top 2/5 and SAT 500	56	65	72	10	7
Top 2/5 and SAT 600	46	50	71	25	12
GPA - 2.50 and SAT 700	37	55	77	40	22
Top 3/5 and SAT 800	27	43	72	40	29
GPA	26	42	72	40	30
3. Either-Or Model					
Top 2/5 or SAT 1100	60	67	74	15	7
Top 2/5 or SAT 1000	60	66	76	16	8
GPA 3.0 or SAT 900	43	61	73	30	12
Top 1/5 or SAT 800	45	57	75	30	22
4. Sliding Scale Model[2]	45	59	75	29	16
5. Predicted Performance[3]					
Sample Inst. A	40	60	72	32	12
Sample Inst. B	37	58	72	35	14

Source: Excerpted from Hunter M. Breland, An Examination of State University and College Admissions Policies. Research Report 85-3. Princeton, N.J.; Educational Testing Service, 1985.

Notes:

1. The comparisons in the table reflect situations where about three-fourths of white students are eligible, which is a common level of selectivity among public universities and colleges.

2. Sliding scales typically emphasize high school rank or GPA at the higher ability levels, with either no test score requirement or with a relative low test score minimum at the higher ability levels. Five different sliding scales were examined in the Breland study. The sliding scale presented here represents the same level of selectivity as other examples in their table. In this sliding scale, all students in the upper tenth of their high school class mark are eligible. There is no test score requirement for students at this level or rank. Students in the second tenth are required to have an SAT combined scores (verbal plus math) of at least 800; students in the second fifth, 700; students in the third fifth, 900; students in the fourth fifth, 1100; and students in the last fifth, 1300.

3. Predicted performance models use a weighted combination of the high school record and test scores to predict college freshman GPA. For the analyses reported here, weighted combinations of high school GPA and SAT combined scores (verbal plus math) were used. Students predicted to attain freshman GPA's of at least 2.60 were considered eligible. Ten sample institutions, all state universities and representing a range of activities, were examined in the Breland study. Sample institutions A and B presented here represent the same level of selectivity as other examples in this table.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this development of new standards for high school graduation and college admissions are undergoing rapid change. These changes will have differential impacts upon secondary and postsecondary institutions, students and educational programs. It is not clear whether or not these changes in standards will improve the education quality of our students.

REFERENCES

1. Peter W. V. San Francisco United School District, 131 Cal. Ppor. 854 (1976).

2. Donahue V. Copiague Unim Tree School District, 407 N.Y.S. 2d 874 (1978).

3. Public Hearing on Excellence in Education. Dallas, Texas: October 1982, p 15. ED 244541.

4. Melvin, Leland D. Standard to Demand for Promotion and Graduation. Paper presented at the 43rd Annual Meeting of the National School Board's Association, San Francisco, CA, April 1983, pp 3-15. ED245396.

5. Debra P. V. Turlington, 644 F 2d 397 (5th Cir. 1981).

6. Wells V. Banks, 266 S.E. 2d 220 (Ga App. 1981).

7. Millman, J. Passing scores and test lengths for domain-referenced measures. Review of Educational Records, 1973, 43, 205-216.

8. Meskauskas, J. A. Evaluation models for criterion-referenced testing: Views regarding mastory and standard setting. Review of Educational Research, 1976, 46, 133-158.

9. McClung, M. Are Competency testing programs fair? legal? Phi Delta Kappan, 1978, 59, 61, 397-399.

10. McClung, M. Competency testing: Potential for documentation. In Peter W. Airasean, et al (eds). Minimal Competency Testing, Educational Technology Publications. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: 1979.

11. Ferratier, L. and Helmick, E. An analysis of Illinois high school graduation requirements. Illinois School Board of Education, Springfield, June 1983, p. 10, ED 238153

12. National Center for Education Statistics. School district survey of academic requirements and achievement. United States Department of Education, 1983.

13. Rickes, Persis C. Admission standards: National trends in public higher education. Connecticut State Board of High Education, 1983, ED240931.

14. Southern Regional Education Board. Raising requirements for high school graduation and college admissions. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1983.

15. Thomson, S. D. College Admissions: New Requirements by State Universities. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1982.

16. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Getting into college: A survey of changing admission requirements in western public education. Boulder, Colorado: 1982.

17. American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers and the College Board. Undergraduate admissions: The realities of institutional policies, practices, and procedures. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1980.

18. Goertz, Margaret E., and Johnson, Linda M. State Policies for Admission to Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1986.

19. Breland, Hunter M. An examination of state university and college admission policies. Research Report 85-3. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1985.

NEEDS ASSESSMENT IN VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL EDUCATION

Kenneth R. Allen
Georgia State University

Needs assessment and documentation have become a prevalent practice for vocational technical schools and programs in recent years. Since the 1976 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, there has been increased emphasis on program accountability and needs assessments have been utilized in the data gathering process for numerous types of evaluations.

This discussion will focus on current needs assessment issues in the State of Georgia in vocational technical education. The discussion will first focus on background information so that the needs assessment process may be placed in perspective.

Purposes of Post-Secondary Vocational Technical Education

A primary objective of technical and occupational education in Georgia is to promote economic development within the State. This is accomplished basically in three ways:

1. By providing a basic work force which is technically competent.

2. By conducting specialized start-up training for new and expanding industries.

3. By conducting short term training in almost any occupational area on an as needed basis.

A second objective is to serve as a link between schooling and work. That is, to provide the post-high school age person with the opportunity for training in the occupational area of their choice.

A third objective is to provide an opportunity for continuing education opportunities of an occupational nature for the overall community served by the school.

Issues in Technical Education

There are several big issues which are affecting the Vocational Technical Education System in Georgia at the present time. These are:

Creation of a State Board of Postsecondary Vocational Education – On July 1, 1985, Governor Joe Frank Harris appointed a State Board specifically to oversee the Postsecondary Technical Schools in Georgia. The transition from State School Board control to Postsecondary Board is a development of superordinate importance to any other issue in the technical education community at the present time. This new board, which is comprised almost entirely of business and industrial leaders, is especially conscious of the need to plan and evaluate decisions based on accurate needs assessment information.

Associate Degree Programs – The conversion of six schools in the system to Associate Degree status with the attendant move from the Commission on Occupational Education Institutions to the Commission on Colleges of SACS is a continuing area of concern to many in the Vo-Tech System as well as the University System.

The final effectiveness of these schools as college level institutions is an area of needs assessment that must be addressed.

High Technology – The potential impact of technology on employment, and its

impact on occupational preparation programs is still only partially understood. While the schools have conducted a great deal of study on analysis of this problem, a continuing effort combining the resources of business and industry with those of education will be needed to keep programs responsive to needs.

Sources of Needs Assessment Data

We at Georgia State University have been involved in the collection of needs assessment data for use by state level decision makers for the past several months. Data of this type comes from a variety of sources. Key pieces of information which facilitate the needs assessment and subsequent decision making process in technical education are:

State and Federal Department of Labor and Bureau of Labor Statistics Data – This information is the most current source of labor supply and demand information.

Census Bureau – The Census Bureau provides demographics on population data by age, educational level, and current occupation which can be connected to substate and localized information. It is commonly used to generate a trend analysis of a specific geographical location.

Area Planning and Development Commission Data – The 18 APDC's in the State of Georgia generate an enormous amount of information each year on the demographic and economic trends in their area. This data is of enormous importance in planning for technical programs. The APDC's are extremely important in moving from state level to more localized projections.

Leadership Forums – Perhaps the single most important data collection tool in the needs assessment process is the gathering of first hand information from local employers and community leaders. Approximately every two years a series of "Leadership Forums" is conducted by the Postsecondary Board in concert with the local schools and the Area Planning and Development Commission. In these meetings the local communities have the opportunity to offer direct input into the decision making process.

Survey Data from Local Schools – Recently each technical school in Georgia has been called upon by the State Board to conduct a local community needs assessment. Should this program be successful it will provide the primary data collection methodology in the future.

Other Sources – Data from several other sources is also important, such as the Department of Industry and Trade Summary of new plant openings and closings as well as their manufacturers and industry directory. The Management Information System of the Georgia Department of Education provides data on program enrollment and placement status.

A somewhat obvious source of data that is often overlooked for determining employment trends is the "Help Wanted" section of the classified ads of local newspapers.

Purposes of Needs Assessment

The purpose of a needs assessment is to determine what ought to be done based on current facts or trends compared to a set of predetermined expectations or criteria. This process is often called discrepancy analysis. Needs assessments may be conducted in educational programs in a number of different functional areas. In the technical education system there are three primary areas of needs assessment.

1. Product evaluation – Data is collected on the outputs or products of vocational education, i.e. the students. This needs assessment process tries to determine what ought to be done relative to the following questions:
   Are students enrolling in our programs?
   Are students successfully completing our programs?
   Are students finding employment after completion?

Are students considered successful in their employment over the long term?

2. Employment Supply and Demand – Needs assessments in this area seek to answer the questions for what occupational areas should we train students and how many should be trained in each area? These questions while seemingly simple are the most difficult to successfully answer. The final decision on programs to initiate, expand, or phase out, impacts on funds, space, equipment, and staff in a profound way. Successful program planning of this type requires a detailed analysis of a complex set of demographic and economic trends which sometimes resemble attempts to predict the stock market.

3. Curriculum Development – Needs assessment in this area simply seeks to answer the question "What ought we to teach?" in a specific program. Maximum currency and relevance to the real world of work should always be the goal of curriculum development in technical education. To that end, technical educators routinely utilize content experts from the business and industrial community to review curriculum at all levels, even down to the syllabus level. These advisory groups are instrumental in setting instructional objectives for courses and programs and are the primary source of needs assessment data.

Results of Needs Assessment

Current needs assessments conducted by Georgia State University in the past several months have indicated several areas of concern which must be addressed by the technical education system. These are presented below in no particular order of priority.

Image of Vo-Tech Education – The State System must address the fact that occupational education does not enjoy a particularly favored position in the eyes of many potential students, particularly those in the 18-25 age range.

Economic Development – In a somewhat paradoxical point to the image problem cited above, it is evident that business, community, and industrial leaders across Georgia have a strong perception that Vo-Tech education is a critical factor in the economic well-being of the state.

The Work Ethic/Attitudes – In a series of 23 Leadership Forums conducted in every planning district in Georgia, the GSU research team was told in every meeting that Vo-Tech programs and general education programs should do all in their power to stress work related attitudes including the overall willingness to work at gainful employment, as well as basic procedures such as dress, punctuality, and relations with others. Customer relations was another key area of emphasis by employers.

Job Availability – There are numerous well paying jobs in Georgia for people willing to get training and work up the career ladder. There are, however, few takers in many traditional trade program areas such as metals, mechanics, heating and air conditioning, and construction trades. Whether this is the result of the economy, the image problem of Vo-Tech Education, or work ethic deterioration is unclear. It is, however, a dilemma that must be solved.

Business-Education Partnerships – As perhaps at no other time in the past, there is a need for business and education to work together to develop, deliver, and assess educational programs. The Quality Basic Education Act, economic development trends, and the impact of technology have all contributed to

this need, and in general it is educators who have not responded quickly enough to form more cooperative arrangements.

Trends in Needs Assessment

Briefly, the following trends appear to be at work which will require a more thorough needs assessment process.

Educational programs will be evaluated, as are industries, on the basis of the quality of their product.

Changes in technology will continue to require that the curriculum be modified as the world of work changes. Continuous feedback from the business and industrial community to the educational community will be needed. What engineers call a "Closed-Loop" instructional system will be required.

As education continues to be a prime factor in economic development, business and education must move closer and closer into partnership.

THE NEW CRITERIA FOR ACCREDITATION

James T. Rogers
Commission on Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges & Schools

Good Evening. I bring you greetings from the Commission on Colleges and the entire SACS staff. Let me first say that I welcome the opportunity of addressing this conference. As a former college president in this state for 15 years, I know full well that the institutions of higher education in Georgia--both public and private, junior and senior--are some of the finest in this country. I also know from my presidential experience, and from my new prespective at the Commission on Colleges, that some very exciting developments are taking place right here in Georgia.

I am particularly grateful to have the chance of talking with you about SACS' new "Criteria for Accreditation." I sincerely believe that this new development places all of us, not only on the cutting edge of American higher education, but also at the forefront of regional accreditation.

In recent years, regional accreditation has experienced increasing pressure to hold institutions more accountable for their educational process. It has also been under attack by its critics, and especially during the last decade, has been criticized both from within and from without for its heavy reliance on traditional evaluation measures--measures that have focused almost exclusively on processes and resources. Much of the criticism has been legitimate, especially as new kinds of institutions have evolved and as the more established colleges and universities have developed new kinds of programs and innovative delivery systems.

The SACS leadership recognized some years ago that the time had come to reexamine its standards and procedures in order to determine whether new approaches were called for. In doing so, the Commission also understood that the old standards, which had focused on resources and processes, had stood us in good stead for many years and that it would not be in the best interests of our membership to completely abandon the old and go with something entirely new.

With this in mind, it is important to spend just a few minutes placing the new "Criteria" in an historical perspective.

In 1980, the Commission on Colleges conducted a survey of its membership to determine their perceptions about accreditation. The study included college administrators and faculty, as well as local, state and federal agency personnel. Almost 2,000 educators throughout the nation were surveyed. The results of this survey, which served as a kind of foundation for the project to revise the standards for accreditation, indicated that basically the respondents were satisfied with the association procedures which had remained relatively unchanged for over two decades. The respondents also strongly endorsed the self-study process, but felt that accreditation standards relied too heavily upon resources and should begin to place a stronger emphasis on the results of the educational process, namely, student learning.

As a result of this very important survey, the leadership of the commission, with the endorsement of the membership, initiated the project to revise the standards. Throughout the effort, over 250 people, working through almost a dozen committees, helped to give shape to the "Criteria." Six seminars were held throughout the southern region to discuss the document. When the "Criteria" was presented to the membership in 1983, it was adopted in principle. However, concern was expressed by a significant percentage of the membership about the new thrust on

outcomes assessment. A number of people disagreed with the philosophy of outcomes assessment and felt that too heavy a reliance on outcomes assessment would reduce the educational process to elements which could only be quantifiably measured. While approving the outcomes assessment approach in principle, other individuals felt that this new approach would make accreditation too bureaucratic or too costly. Thus, in response to the criticism of the membership, the chairman of the Commission on Colleges withdrew the section on outcomes assessment and appointed a special committee to review this new thrust.

The review committee was charged with the responsibility of not only editing the "Criteria," but also preparing a new section which would replace the original statement on outcomes assessment.

Every member institution was given an opportunity to submit its concerns and suggestions to the committee, and the committee addressed these problems during the spring and summer of 1984. Of particular concern to the review committee was that the new statement not be overly prescriptive, and that institutions be allowed a great deal of flexibility in developing individual approaches. The committee also felt that there were too many negatives associated with the term "outcomes assessment" and that in its place the terms "planning and evaluation" should be used. There appeared to be little disagreement that these terms more clearly describe what is needed to assess student achievement. The institutional research function was incorporated into this new section because committee members strongly felt that institutional research was a critical element in any effective planning and evaluation process. With this in mind, the committee adopted the term "institutional effectiveness" for this section of the "Criteria", and incorporated planning, evaluation and institutional research under this umbrella term. When the new section on institutional effectiveness was presented to the College Delegate Assembly in December 1984, it was adopted overwhelmingly.

Thus, with the adoption of the "Criteria for Accreditation" in 1984, this document replaced the "Standards of the College Delegate Assembly."

Before we examine Section III of the "Criteria" more closely, we should, perhaps, talk a little about how the "Criteria" differs from the "Standards." There were, for example, eleven standards. The "Criteria" has six sections, essentially addressing the same educational functions, but organized in a more consistent fashion. All the former sections of the old "Standards" dealing with the educational program can now be found in one section in the "Criteria." Likewise, all purely administrative processes and educational support services are together in one section.

Section I, Principles and Philosophy of Accreditation, includes the 14 conditions of eligibility for candidacy and the two conditions of eligibility for membership. These conditions, by the way, will be reviewed by a special committee this spring and recommended changes will be brought before the College Delegate Assembly next December.

Section II, Institutional Purpose, requires an institution to examine its purpose. Language in this section also requires that the planning and evaluation processes be designed to demonstrate that the institution's purpose and role are being fulfilled.

Section III, Institutional Effectiveness, includes subsections on planning and evaluation and institutional research. Under the old "Standards," it was assumed that if an institution had certain resources and used certain processes, effective education would occur. This particular section states that while resources and processes are important, the evaluation of the results of education and plans for the improvement of the institution are equally important.

Section IV, Educational Program, requires that the principal focus of an institution be the education of its students. It also requires that all aspects of the educational program be

clearly related to the purposes of the institution. Included in Section IV are subsections on the undergraduate program, graduate program, continuing education, and faculty.

Section V, Educational Support Services, includes the library, instructional support, computer services, and student development services.

And finally, Section VI, Administrative Processes, includes organization and administration, financial resources, physical resources, and externally funded grants and contracts.

Throughout all of these sections there is language addressing planning and evaluation processes.

The committees which worked on the "Criteria" made a concerted effort to clarify the language in the document and to make the new language less ambiguous than it had been in the "Standards." Under the "Standards," for example, "musts" and "shoulds" were never clearly understood by the institutions being reviewed or by the visiting committees. In the "Criteria," a "must" statement represents something that is clearly a requirement. "Should" statements, on the other hand, indicate something that is advised.

Finally, and most importantly, the "Criteria" differs from the "Standards" in that Section III, "Institutional Effectiveness", represents an entirely new thrust in the accreditation process.

At this point, it is important to point out that Section III of the "Criteria" has fewer "must" statements than any other of the sections. The five requirements established in the section of institutional effectiveness are that:

1. Institutions must establish adequate procedures for planning and evaluation.

2. Institutions must define their expected educational results and describe how the achievement of these results will be ascertained.

3. Institutions with research and public service missions must develop and implement appropriate procedures for evaluating their effectiveness in these areas.

4. Institutions must engage in continuing study, analysis and appraisal of their purposes, policies, procedures and programs.

5. Institutions regularly must evaluate the institutional research function.

On the other hand, there are a number of statements in this section which suggest what an effective planning and evaluation process should include:

1. Broad-based involvement of faculty and administration;

2. The establishment of a clearly defined purpose appropriate to collegiate education;

3. The formulation of educational goals consistent with the institution's purpose;

4. The development of procedures for evaluating the extent to which these educational goals are being achieved; and

5. The use of the results of these evaluations to improve institutional effectiveness.

The very last paragraph of the subsection on planning and evaluation, however, very clearly indicates that "the appropriateness of any evaluation procedure depends upon the nature of the institution and institution's goals for instruction, research and public service." Further, the section very clearly states that "the Commission on Colleges prescribes no set of procedures for use by an institution and recognizes that an effective program to evaluate institutional effectiveness will usually require the use of a variety of procedures."

Thus, the section on institutional effectiveness, while requiring institutions to adopt planning and evaluation processes, allows institutions to develop these processes in accordance with their own goals--without restriction and without specific data-collection methods. While it provides guidelines for improvement, the section imposes no specific performance standards nor does it mandate any particular approach to planning and evaluation. Institutional effectiveness also encourages institutions to continue the momentum that results from the self-study process. In other words, it emphasizes the need for an institution to invest in the ongoing capacity to study itself.

Historically the self-study process, while it has been a very important part of institutional evaluation, has been for many institutions an isolated event occurring only once every decade. It has not, until the adoption of the "Criteria for Accreditation," and even more particularly the adoption of Section III of the "Criteria," required an institution to have an ongoing capacity to study itself. The new emphasis on institutional effectiveness encourages the administrative leadership of an institution to use an ongoing planning and evaluation process as the basis for major decision-making activities at the institution, thereby providing clearer options for policy-making and problem-solving.

Perhaps most important of all, however, is that the new emphasis on institutional effectiveness will result in a more integrated campus-wide planning process. In far too many institutions this effort has been fragmented. It also encourages the use of a common data base using accessible and reliable data which can, by producing standardized information, assist management in functioning more effectively.

From another perspective, the new emphasis on institutional effectiveness gives the visiting committee a more appropriate mechanism for evaluating all types of learning experiences, thereby giving institutions a greater freedom to explore new teaching methodologies to meet the special needs of a new generation of learners.

While I have mentioned some of the positive effects that the "Criteria" can have on member institutions, I must, at the same time, acknowledge that the "Criteria" does not provide all the answers and, indeed, even raises for all of us some very difficult questions:

To name only a few:

1. What guidelines, for example, will visiting committees use to determine the "adequacy" of an institution's planning and evaluation efforts?

2. What kinds of "specific" skills do members of visiting committees need to effectively evaluate these efforts?

3. How can the Commission on Colleges best train its future visiting committee members to adequately assess the effectiveness of an institution?

4. What resources can be made available to member institutions to help them develop effective and cost-efficient processes? How can the Commission best serve its constituency in this area?

We are working to resolve these and other questions.

Ladies and gentlemen, what we have in our new "Criteria" is an opportunity to explore and learn together--for an accrediting agency and its constituent members to enhance the credibility and accountability of both. The new section on "Institutional Effectiveness" is a very modest, first step. We continue in our conviction that outcomes assessment must have its place in the legitimate concerns of the accrediting process. We are steadfast in our conviction that it is both reasonable and necessary to require that an accredited institution be able to describe what it is trying to achieve, how it measures the extent of that achievement, and that it is achieving its objectives to a reasonable degree.

Indeed, we are equally convinced that if we fail in this endeavor, the future of private, voluntary, regional accreditation may be in

question. And we do not have the luxury of debating the issue for very long. Either we do it, collectively through accrediting standards, and individually through an institutional commitment to be truly accountable, or it is likely that other agencies will do it for us–and to us. That's not running scared. That's facing reality.

Quality judgments about higher education are presently in the hands of the so–called "triad"–state government, the federal government, and voluntary accreditation–each with its legitimate role. The possibility–through abandonment, default, or abrogation–of losing the self-regulatory element of that triad and leaving quality assessment and control solely in the hands of governmental agencies, is not very palatable to most folks in higher education. The appropriate implementation of procedures for assessment of outcomes, under whatever rubric, is crucial to the retention of the self-regulatory element of the triad.

Charles McClain, Northeast Missouri State University:

> "I think the public wants assurance today that a college degree has some integrity–that what it represents isn't being left to chance."

THE IMPLICATIONS OF NEW SACS CRITERIA FOR INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Larry G. Jones
Institutional Research and Planning
The University of Georgia

Accreditation, or more precisely the self-study process upon which accreditation is based, has always had significant implications for the function and process of institutional research. Self-study, after all, is institutional research and institutional research is self-study.

Recognizing the role of institutional research in the accreditation/self-study process, if not the more pervasive evaluation of the institution's self-proclaimed mission, earlier standards of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) carried the following statement about the necessity of institutional research and planning in "sound" administration and the importance of "continuing study, analysis, and appraisal of [institutional] purposes, processes, and programs." The results of institutional research were to be evident in the "major decisions and projections" shaping the institution's operation and its "academic and administrative functions." In short, the SACS-accredited institution was expected to do institutional research.

Institutional Research and Planning

> Institutional research and planning are necessary functions of sound administration. Organization of these responsibilities will depend upon the size and complexity of the institution; however, all institutions should engage in continuing study, analysis, and appraisal of their purposes, processes, and programs. The results of these studies should be evident in the consideration given to major decisions and projections which shape the future course of the institution's operation. Both academic and administrative functions should show evidence of continuing and systematic critical analysis. Responsibility for direction and coordination of these studies should be explicitly assigned to one or more staff offices which should be provided the necessary resources and access to information sources to discharge these duties effectively. ("Standards of the College Delegate Assembly," Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Atlanta, 1977, p. 8)

In fact, the mention of institutional research in the SACS Organization and Administration Standard probably gave considerable impetus to the creation of institutional research and planning offices and positions at colleges and universities in the Southern Association states. It did so at the University of Georgia. The new criteria promise to be an even greater impetus for such offices.

The prominence SACS accorded to institutional research in the accrediting process and in the evaluation of institutional vitality helps explain why the South has played so significant a role in the development of institutional research as a practice and profession. It would be ironic if the SACS "Standards" actually had been as instrumental in establishing institutional research in southern institutions as suspected, for a small but distinguished group of southern institutional researchers argues that the new SACS "Criteria" is the inevitable response to the questions raised and answers given by institutional researchers to the issues facing higher education. This group of colleagues would contend that my paper should be titled "The Implications of Institutional Research For New SACS Criteria," rather than the "Implications of the New SACS Criteria for Institutional Research." Regardless of which side of that argument one chooses to take, the implications for institutional research in the new SACS "Criteria" are significant.

An increasingly important function of institutional research is to monitor internal and external pressures on higher education. One can assume that the College Delegate Assembly was responding to an environmental assessment when it set out to revise the SACS "Standards." There is a very clear public concern for quality and accountability in all of education, an observation reinforced by institutional research (if not discovered by it in the first place). The SACS response to internal and external pressures, and the resulting "Criteria," underscore the dependency relationship between institutional research and accreditation. The creation of the new criteria established a different emphasis in the accreditation process, provided a new focus for institutional self-study, and made a dramatic statement about what was important in higher education. In the words of the "Criteria":

> The quality of education provided by member institutions is the primary consideration in the decision to confer or reaffirm accreditation. The evaluation of educational quality is a difficult task requiring careful analysis and professional judgment. Traditionally, accreditation has focused attention almost exclusively upon institutional resources and processes. It has usually been assumed that, if an institution has certain resources and uses certain processes, effective education will occur. A comprehensive approach to accreditation, however, takes into account not only the resources and processes of education (such as faculty and student qualifications, physical plant, fiscal resources and other elements addressed in the Criteria) but also the evaluation of the results of education and plans for the improvement of the institution's programs.
>
> The level of institutional quality depends not only on an institution's educational processes and resources but also on the institution's successful use of those processes and resources to achieve established goals. Institutions have an obligation to all constituents to evaluate effectiveness and to use the results in a broad-based, continuous planning and evaluation process. ("Criteria for Accreditation," Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Atlanta, 1984, p. 9)

While the implications for institutional research in that statement are clearly more implicit than explicit, they become much clearer in the specific reference to institutional research in the "Criteria":

> 3.2 Institutional Research
>
> Because institutional research can provide significant information on all phases of a college or university program, it is an essential element in planning and evaluating the institution's success in carrying out its purpose. The nature of the institutional research function depends on the size and complexity of the institution and may vary from a part-time operation to an office staffed by several persons. However, all institutions must engage in continuous study, analysis and appraisal of their purposes, policies, procedures and programs. Institutions should assign administrative responsibility for carrying out institutional research. Institutional research should be allocated adequate resources, and those responsible for it should be given access to all relevant information. Institutions regularly must evaluate the institutional research function. (p. 10)

Although the IR section in the "Criteria" has not changed dramatically from the previously quoted statement found in the old "Standards," the differences are still quite significant.

First of all, the institutional research statement has been placed in the Institutional Effectiveness section of the new "Criteria" the focal point of the document.

Second, the two "must" imperatives in the Institutional Research statement may be the most important of the new criteria. (All

"must" statements in the "Criteria" are to be interpreted as imperatives, whereas all "should" statements are advisory.) The first great commandment of accreditation under the new SACS "Criteria" is ". . . all institutions must engage in continuous study, analysis and appraisal of their purposes, policies, procedures and programs." The second commandment of SACS accreditation is like unto it: "The institutional research function must be regularly evaluated." On these two statements hang all the process and procedure of institutional accreditation. Could there be any criteria more central to the entire accrediting process? Under the old "Standards," an institution was expected to do institutional research. Under the new "Criteria," institutional research literally and figuratively must be done to gain accreditation.

As critical as institutional research is in accreditation, it's not an end in itself but rather a means to the end. By "Criteria" definition, institutional research is "the continuous study, analysis and appraisal of institutional purposes, policies, procedures and programs." Ad hoc telephone surveys of the "old buddy network," occasional campus questionnaires, and faculty/administrative committee reports are not what the delegates had in mind when they wrote the IR criterion. Self-study has become by mandate a "continuous" process, not an exercise undertaken once every decade.

The "Criteria" says nothing about how the institutional research function is to be carried out, only that administrative responsibility for the activity should be assigned. There is no mandate for an office of institutional research or even for someone called an institutional researcher. By simple logic, however, anyone conducting institutional research is an institutional researcher. In light of what is expected of institutional research activity under the "Criteria," it is extremely difficult to imagine how the IR function can be carried out without a coordinator. Coordination does not necessarily mean centralization, but it is essential for the efficient and effective use of institutional resources.

The new "Criteria" also refocuses the institutional research effort. The old "Standards" directed the self-study effort toward quantitative and historical records. The emphasis was on attainment. The new direction is qualitative, process-oriented, and directed more toward accomplishment. Although the "Criteria," like the "Standards," gives relatively little specific direction to the ongoing IR function, there are some clues concerning priorities in the accreditation review. Two central themes in the new "Criteria" with considerable implications for IR are planning and evaluation.

Institutional planning has enjoyed such a close relationship with institutional research that the two are typically linked in office and function titles. Although some assume that the two are separate functions, they really are not. Planning requires institutional research, and institutional research will inevitably lead to planning.

Clearly, institutional research is a required part of the planning process directed by the "Criteria." The direct implication for institutional research is the imperative that ". . . the planning and evaluation processes must be designed to demonstrate that the institution's purpose and role are being fulfilled." The "Criteria" continues:

> In addition to establishing procedures for evaluating the extent to which their educational goals are being achieved, institutions should ascertain periodically the change in the academic achievement of their students. Procedures used to evaluate instructional programs may include: peer evaluation of educational programs; structured interviews with students and graduates; changes in students' values as measured by standard instruments or self-reported behavior patterns; pre- and post-testing of students; surveys of recent graduates; surveys of employers of graduates; student scores on standardized examinations or locally constructed examinations; performance of graduates in graduate school; performance of graduates of professional programs on

> licensure examinations; or, the placement of graduates of occupational programs in positions related to their fields of preparation. (pp. 9-10)

In addition to the required evaluation of the instructional mission, the new "Criteria" emphasizes ". . . that institutions with research or public service missions must develop and implement appropriate procedures for evaluating their effectiveness in these areas." And, to avoid any doubt about what constitutes appropriate evaluation procedures, the document goes on to say:

> The appropriateness of any evaluation procedure depends upon the nature of the institution and the institution's goals for instruction, research and public service. The Commission on Colleges prescribes no set of procedures for use by an institution and recognizes that an effective program to evaluate institutional effectiveness will usually require the use of a variety of procedures. (p. 10)

In my opinion, the "effective program to evaluate institutional effectiveness" is identified as institutional research by the "Criteria."

The lack of specifics and the emphasis on finding suitable institutional procedures in planning and evaluation are significant in more than a philosophical way. For many institutions, the lack of specificity in the institutional effectiveness section will be a burden, not a benefit. The common rule of accreditation self-study has been to follow the "book," and a lack of direction may simply frustrate the faculty and administration rather than stimulate creative responses. Many institutions have a significant, but still uncoordinated institutional research effort, and therefore may lack the resources or expertise to dedicate to the required IR effort. To the rescue, of course, will come vendors with all forms of products to meet the IR functions for such institutions. That cannot be all bad, but as a solution it does pose interesting issues for evaluating the institutional research function and its role in the accreditation process.

A final major implication for institutional research is the mandate for the ongoing evaluation of the institutional research function. The form and substance of such evaluation is not clear; there are no criteria for this evaluation either. Nonetheless, to keep in the spirit of the "Criteria," several points should be true about the evaluation of IR. First, institutional research and researchers should be extended the same courtesy as other units on campus by having professional colleagues do the evaluation. "Evaluation [of institutional research] . . . is a difficult task requiring careful analysis and professional judgment," to paraphrase a "Criteria" statement. Some common set of evaluation standards for the institutional research function should be devised to assist the institution preparing for the review and to help mostly unknowledgeable reviewers examine the institutional research activity. Because an institutional researcher will probably not be included on every SACS visitation team (there aren't many IR types to begin with, and fewer still on the SACS examination rosters), some effort will have to be made to acquaint visitation team members with what IR does. To this end, the Southern Association for Institutional Research has offered to provide SACS with whatever help it can in preparing visitation teams for this directed responsibility. Whether intended or not, the new SACS "Criteria" has made institutional research the pivotal process in accreditation. It may therefore be prudent for SACS to provide more direction for its effective practice and evaluation. The clearer intent of the "Criteria" is to improve the quality of decision-making and educational/institutional outcomes through institutional research. In fact, there is not a perfect correlation between the quality of institutional research and the quality of institutional planning and decision-making, and the evaluation of the IR process cannot be judged completely on an evaluation of the anticipated or desired institutional outcomes. The new SACS "Criteria" should improve the

relationship between IR and decision-making. If it does, the contribution it makes to the quality of higher education will indeed be noteworthy.

Under the new "Criteria," it is possible for an institution to do institutional research and not be accredited. It is not possible. however, for an institution to be accredited without doing institutional research.

IMPLICATIONS OF SACS' NEW CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

Leroy Ervin and Louise M. Tomlinson
Division of Developmental Studies
The University of Georgia

The question of implications of the new "Criteria" for Developmental Studies raises some considerations about the processes involved in implementing those criteria in terms of the new standards for high school graduation and college admissions. These considerations indicate that impact upon developmental programs will be very gradual and that change in the structure or purpose of developmental programs, in response to the new criteria, may not be seen for the next five to ten years. The critical factors which will ultimately affect developmental programs are teacher training, legislation, and the assessment and evaluation processes at the secondary and post-secondary levels. Each of these factors will be significant in determining if, when, or how the purpose, content, or scope of developmental programs will change, and a considerable amount of time will elapse before any of these barometers will register new directions for post-secondary remedial programs.

Teacher Training

Since the existence of Developmental Studies programs is contingent upon standards of admission of our institutions of higher education, teacher training will, in part, be a determining factor in directions for post-secondary remedial programs. Teacher effectiveness will, to a great extent, influence the success ratios of students who will attempt to meet the new "Criteria" for regular admissions to the university system. The minimum standards, four units of English, three units of math, three units of science, three units of social science, and two units of foreign language, required for entry into the post-secondary system, will, no doubt, create a need for revised teacher training, programs.

At this time we must consider some of the following questions about teacher personnel. Is the supply there to fill the need? Are there too many teachers in the system who hold provisional certificates? Is there adequate quality control in teacher education at the college level? And, are we, therefore, lacking quality as well as quantity in our current teacher force? The answers to these questions suggest that, without some changes in teacher training, there will still be considerable numbers of high school graduates in 1988, and beyond, who will fall short of the new standards and will, therefore, seek provisional admission into Developmental Studies programs.

The rate at which teacher training programs impact upon secondary education will determine the extent to which change will take place in Developmental Studies programs. And, again, it will take time before such impact will be affected.

Legislation

Another factor that will, in part, be influential in the direction that post-secondary remedial programs will take is legislation. Legislation is, essentially, the foundation for funding. If we consider the fact that the new statewide standards encompass a number of locales that vary in socioeconomic characteristics, then we must take into account the fact that the success ratios of secondary schools in producing graduates who will meet the new "Criteria" will vary tremendously, from district to district, particularly at the outset. Where the "Criteria" is most in conflict with the values and resources of the school community, there will likely be a greater elapse of time before the "Criteria" is wholly

implemented and manifest in the products of the schools.

Unless state funding initiates and follows some continuous formula based on need, to equalize the implementation of the new "Criteria," then there will be a lag in implementation and achievement. By asking questions like "what basis is there for creating equality?" and "how long will it take?", we must realize that, for some time to come there will still be a need for Developmental Studies programs.

Assessment and Evaluation

Finally, the assessment and evaluation of the implementation and achievement of the new "Criteria" at the secondary level will also be an influential factor in determining new directions for post-secondary remedial programs. Whether pedagogical practices provide adequate momentum toward the goals set by the College Board, how individual perceptions influence the mechanism, and the extent to which the new criteria is met, are some of the considerations which will require thorough investigation. The difference between intent and effect has been recognized by Popkewitz, Tabachnick, and Wehlage (1982) as an important consideration in assessment and evaluation of reformed curricula and administrative procedures when introduced into the "real world" of schools. As a result of their investigation of a particular reform program and its institutionalization in several schools, these researchers formulated the following questions.

> "How do specific social/cultural characteristics filter into the school to influence instructional practices? What are the implications of teachers' different and potentially conflicting perceptions of their occupational role? Since professionals do have relative autonomy in establishing pedagogical practices, how is this autonomy exercised to create, sustain, and renew occupational ideologies? And, what are the roles played by state and local education agencies, teachers' associations and unions, and teacher preparation institutes in establishing and legitimating the new criteria?" (p. 180)

These and a host of other more traditional questions need to be answered, not only by quantitative, but by qualitative investigation which would include in-depth questionnaire and field study techniques. Assessment and evaluation will take time. Again, the direction of Developmental Studies programs will, in part, be influenced by the interpretation of emerging data.

Conclusions

Assuming that the "Criteria" are met favorably, then Developmental Studies programs will eventually change in purpose, content, and scope. Dwindling numbers of students seeking provisional admission could mean that Developmental Studies would be gasping its last breath a few years from now. As an alternative to this situation, the larger institutions could raise their standards again, artificially creating a need for developmental programs. However, the new high school curriculum will not guarantee that all of its graduates will qualify for admission to the university within the system, although many will qualify for the colleges. From this perspective, it seems likely that the flagship institution would continue to operate its provisional admissions program while the smaller schools within the system may elect to discontinue such services. Most immediately, in an effort to remain competitive, Developmental Studies programs might attempt to create more integrated, more interdisciplinary approaches to instruction across its three basic skills areas.

REFERENCES

Popkewitz, S., Tabachnick, B., and Wehlage, G. The myth of educational reform: A study of school responses to a program of change. Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1982.

IMPLICATIONS ON SACS' NEW CRITERIA FOR INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Ronald D. Simpson
Office of Instructional Development
The University of Georgia

In preparation for the task of relating SACS' new criteria to instructional development I decided to use my dictionary and look up the correct definition of a couple terms. I was quite intrigued with Webster's definition of the terms "implicate" and "implication." One definition stated that this means "to fold or twist together." An alternative definition was "to bring into intimate or incriminating connection." Still another approach to defining this concept was "a logical relationship between two propositions." These definitions were interesting and several thoughts came to mind in thinking about how SACS' "Criteria" should relate to instructional development in higher education. I did not find a definition for "instructional development" and so, had to construct one myself. I define instructional development as the sum total of attitudes, resources, knowledge, and activities embedded in an institution that when mobilization can be used for the promotion of effective teaching. It is my hope, then, that our discussion on this topic will allow us to take some of the SACS' "Criteria" and examine their relationship to instruction in higher education.

There are numerous criteria in the new SACS' document that relate, directly or indirectly, to instruction. I have selected six areas that I think are pertinent for today's discussion. The following paragraphs will contain some of these connections.

Institutional Purpose, Planning and Evaluation

I have been impressed with Kenneth Ebel's account in "The Craft of Teaching" of how a society can best promote valued activities. He says that if he wanted to restore the Druid Priesthood the most effective means would be to build forests in which they could live—rather than offer a "Druid of the Year Award." Ebel's analogy is most appropriate within our context. The most effective way to promote good teaching is to have institutional goals and rewards that reflect the value of this activity. SACS' guidelines under Section III, Institutional Effectiveness, urge us to attend to procedures for planning and evaluation. This is where we should begin with respect to instructional development. I would say that now is the time to examine the following:

*the changing nature of our society

*the changing nature of our students

*the changing nature of our disciplines and professions

*the values held by our social institutions that relate to teaching and learning

*the creation and maintenance of an environment and ambience that promote rigorous inquiry, high quality scholarship, and an enthusiasm for learning together.

In short, for there to be serious instructional development within an organization there first must be serious planning. This planning should contribute both to the instructional goals of the institution as well as outline strategies for evaluating instructional outcomes.

Undergraduate Instruction

As stated, undergraduate instruction should flow from the goals of the institution. SACS' guidelines make it clear that course goals and objectives should be formulated and made public to students at the outset of any

educational experience. Instructional methods should be comprised of those techniques that are most effective in producing the desired learning outcomes. For example, instead of always telling students how scientists operate, perhaps it would be better to provide them with opportunities to get involved in science-related behaviors. The evaluation procedures used in a given course should measure the desired outcomes of that course, and this information should be used to improve instruction.

Graduate Instruction

The heart and core of good graduate instruction is bringing together in a facilitating environment active, productive, and competent scholars with enthusiastic, motivated, and capable students. Graduate faculty members should not only stimulate creative investigation of ideas, but should be accessible to their students and serve as responsible role models in their disciplines or professions.

Faculty Development

Institutions must provide opportunities for continuing growth and renewal of their faculty. The movement of faculty from institution to institution and the influx of new faculty into academe that characterized the 1960s and early 1970s no longer serves as a natural source of renewal. At The University of Georgia, and probably this is not unlike other institutions, two-thirds of the faculty is over 40 and one-third is over 50. This "graying" of the faculty combined with the fact that students are perhaps less prepared, yet more sophisticated in other ways, from years past produces an ever-widening gap between teacher and student. This presents problems of national concern. Also, many current reports sound alarm that we may not be able to attract and retain in the future the quality of professoriate that we have enjoyed in the past.

Faculty development should be a continual process with equal attention being paid to early career, midcareer and late career faculty. Each of these groups has special needs and colleges and universities benefit by having programs that address these needs.

Instructional Resources and Services

As the instructional process becomes more complex the more important it will be for institutions to provide faculty with appropriate resources amd services. The guidelines in the new SACS document specifically address many important resources and indirectly suggest others. Some of the resources and services that should be provided are:

*audiovisual and duplicating services

*instructional design assistance

*small grants

*assistance with external funding

*computer literacy workshops

*testing and evaluation services

*learning centers for students

With the advent of computer assisted instruction has come the discovery that it takes between 50 and 200 hours of work to produce one hour of high quality instruction. If faculty do convert portions of their curriculum into software delivered systems, institutions will need to provide the kind of technical assistance necessary to make this practice feasible.

Support Services for GTAs

One of the most noticeable additions to the new SACS "Criteria" has been the attention paid to the qualifications of graduate teaching assistants. Graduate students who have primary responsibility for teaching a course are required to have 18 semester hours of coursework in that area. With increased concern over the question of how much instruction should be delivered by graduate students will come an increased need

for institutions to provide training, supervisory, and evaluation programs for GTAs. This investment not only leads to immediate gains for the institution and its students but serves to help launch the teaching careers of faculty, hence serving as a major influence on the career-long instructional skills of an individual.

Summary

Many recent reports have urged colleges and universities to pay closer attention to the undergraduate curriculum and to improve undergraduate instruction. Trailsigns point to the fact that instruction in colleges and universities will receive increasingly more attention during the remainder of this century. Challenging times lie ahead and the new SACS' "Criteria" suggest that more attention will be paid to faculty characteristics and institutional support of instruction in future accreditation endeavors. This is an excellent time for institutions to evaluate where they are and where they want to go, and the SACS' new "Criteria" can be a valid guide to use in this process.

REFERENCES

Eble, Kenneth E. The craft of teaching. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1984.

IMPLICATION OF SACS' NEW CRITERIA ON COLLEGE ADMISSIONS

John W. Albright
Office of Admissions
The University of Georgia

Allow me to address you this morning, if you will, not as a struggling student of American higher education. Instead, I would like to reflect on the Southern Association's new mandate for planning and evaluation from my role as a practicing admissions professional—a footsoldier, as it were, involved in the daily struggle among the trenches of our college recruiting wars. The few observations I would like to share with you this morning were put into clear focus last week from a meeting I had been asked to attend.

Last Tuesday I spent the evening with a small group of parents at a nearby public high school outside of Athens. They called themselves the Academic Boosters Club. The school's principal had invited me to share with them any insights they could use for the promotion of academic excellence among the students of their school that I had picked up with my work promoting the University of Georgia's Honors Program and our freshman scholarships.

One of the word pictures that I painted for them involved a sight that is now common across America in the fall: That is the event called the College Fair, where well-dressed admissions representatives from upwards of 250 colleges stand behind tables that are groaning under the weight of stacks of glossy brochures from their institutions while hundreds or even thousands of high school juniors and seniors and their parents shuffle by. We usually hold these fairs now in what has become the mecca of American teenage social life—shopping malls. The symbolism of these events being held in shopping malls, I told the Academic Boosters, is overwhelming: High school students today, in this era of the demographic slide, are Buyers in a Buyers' Market. College-bound adolescents, especially those blue chip scholars with exceptional academic promise similar to the sons and daughters of the Academic Boosters, are rare commodities that we in higher education covet. Stand back, I said, and watch all the promotional literature being sent to your sons and daughters fill up your mail boxes. Take advantage of the phenomenon while you can.

This image seemed to please the Academic Boosters Club. It launched us then into a discussion of many new no-need scholarship programs that colleges are creating as part of their package of recruitment. The Boosters' eyes started to sparkle. We also talked at length about picking colleges that offer the right combination of opportunities for students, and how, in my opinion, most students could do well at any number of different colleges.

Later in our discussion I described the tougher high school curriculum guidelines that all colleges, even junior colleges, in the University System of Georgia will require of entering freshmen in 1988. This has become a hot topic. Admissions colleagues from several Southern states have telephoned me the past few months to find out how the University of Georgia's admissions procedures will change to carry out these new requirements, because their states were enacting similar legislation.

A gray-haired father interrupted me at this point. "Why," he wanted to know, "if you're all having more and more trouble getting students each year, are you raising your admissions requirements? It seems to me that you'd want to lower them."

This Academic Booster was obviously also a student of the American free enterprise system. My answer to him was this: The

effect of these legislated admission standards may well decrease our number of freshmen in the public colleges and universities of our states. I was not sure, even though my office had been studying the matter, and I do not think anyone in our state is right now. The intention of these standards, though, was that these freshmen would be better prepared to handle our academic college curriculum from having been forced to take traditional college preparatory courses in high school. We might have fewer freshmen, but more of them would make it all the way to graduation and, I concluded, we hoped to have the same total enrollment. I finished with a note of optimism by suggesting that we might eventually have even more students, overall, as a result of these new standards.

I repeat this story for you this morning not as a way of discussing "The Nation at Risk," or new admissions requirements, or the content of the general education curriculum. Rather, my evening with the Academic Boosters illustrated three things about the actual practice of admissions officers at this point in our history, and how these three activities may change as our colleges fulfill the spirit of planning and evaluation that Section III of the Southern Association's new "Criteria for Accreditation" calls for.

The first point is that we admissions officers are essentially communicators. That was my role at the meeting of the Academic Boosters. Sometimes our communication involves the mundane. The telephone rings: Have we received Sally's high school transcript yet? When does fall quarter start? Can freshmen have cars? How much is tuition? Do you have a double major in music and marketing? We do what our catalogs or the Peterson's Guide books do for the college selection process, but we are able to do it in a more personal way.

Often our communication is more complex. We explain policies—like the new 1988 guidelines—and we discuss trends—like scholarship recruiting. Here are two typical scenarios that I find are typical in the college admissions business: We meet with twenty seniors in the high school library, or we sit down in our office with mom and dad and their daughter, all dressed in their Sunday finest. In each scenario we begin by discussing the mundane details of admission and enrollment at our institutions, but eventually the conversation deals with more basic issues. The underlying question, which none of us ever asks out loud, becomes, "What will I do when I grow up? Tell me how your college can help me do that."

Our second role, then, is to be college counselors. Our jobs put us in counseling situations on a daily basis, and both our institutions and our shared humanity demand that we help all that we can. This is a traditional view of the function of admissions officers. In fact, we are usually called admissions counselors. But our roles as counselors are sorely tested in the era of the Buyer's Market. Imagine this statement: "I know we have a hundred fewer freshmen this year," we might try to tell our college presidents, "but we in the Admissions Office helped a hundred more students find just the right college for their future development." We all know that argument is doomed.

The final role of admissions officers is a newly developing one. It involves recruiting students, which of course will be our major job on into the 1990s while we wait for the next baby boom to mature to adulthood. This emerging role involves communication and counseling, too. The common term that people have been using to describe this role has been "marketing." Marketing is too narrow a concept, though. It has too crass a business connotation for many people in ivory towers, so new terms are coming into use. One new buzzword that describes this concept is "enrollment management." This concept has major implications, I think, for the function of admissions officers under the requirements for "outcomes assessment," or whatever the Southern Association eventually would like to call the planning for and evaluation of institutional effectiveness.

Under the concept of enrollment management, admissions officers and those

who set admissions policy become part of a large management team made up of faculty and administrators from all areas of an institution. These team members come to manage enrollment by recruiting the most appropriate students for their institution, given its resources and its educational objectives. They give the recruited students appropriate academic, career and personal advising and counseling; and they provide these carefully selected and groomed students with appropriate academic coursework and extracurricular services and stimulation. Enrollment management, carried to its logical conclusion, includes career planning and placement and, eventually, alumni development and fund raising. The admissions officer recruits students with an eye toward their becoming active alumni some day. The alumni officer develops alumni clubs with an eye toward their helping to recruit students and to support the educational growth of those students once they are enrolled. And everyone, from groundskeeper to president, evaluates their effectiveness in relation to the overall policies of the institution's enrollment management goals.

This concept of enrollment management focuses on the students. Unlike the marketing concept that we might borrow from the business world, though, enrollment management does not change the product to fit the real or imagined needs of the market. Enrollment management instead forces all members of a college community to form consensus about what direction their joint educational venture should take, and then asks the admissions officers to recruit the students most appropriate for that venture. The dynamics of the situation keep the admissions officers from simply becoming sales representatives. They help define their institution. They help fill it with students. And, by doing their jobs honestly and well, they help assure that the students they helped recruit actually graduate.

Regardless of enrollment management or any other such trendy concepts that come along though, colleges who commit themselves to an assessment of the outcomes of their labors then logically must first assess their input. Admissions officers stand at the entrance of their institutions, sometime quite literally. It logically follows that we are in the best position to assess, or to help with the assessment at least, of the raw products of our industry. We talk to freshmen first. We encode the data from their admissions applications. We are the first to connect names and faces. Admissions officers today are forming closer working relationships with student data base managers and institutional researchers because of their primary proximity and first name familiarity with this raw data.

At the same time as we offer assistance to this growing need for the gathering of basic data, we are gathering our own kinds of data in our roles as communicators and counselors and recruiters. More than most public relations officers, and almost as much as most presidents, people in admissions offices are daily called on to explain facets of their institutions. We must describe statistics in human terms that teenagers and taxpayers can understand. We must turn policy and data into brochures and videotapes and campus tours.

That is what we do in the admissions trenches. That is the challenge that I and my colleagues face. That is why I read Section III of the SACS "Criteria" and get excited. I see another instance of how admissions will finally break out of its salesmanship stereotype and legitimately become part of the larger scheme of management in higher education.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE NEW CRITERIA FOR ADULT LEARNERS

Margaret E. Holt
Adult Education Department
The University of Georgia

On October 16, 1985, Dr. James Rogers, Executive Director, Commission on Colleges, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, presented the keynote address at the National University Continuing Education Association's Region III meeting in Knoxville, Tennessee. He titled his presentation "Criteria for Accreditation: A Tool for a Future of Excellence for Continuing Education Programs in the South." In December I phoned Jim to ask if I might use his remarks from this meeting as a springboard for my comments today. He most kindly agreed. Overall, Jim's comments reflect a belief that the new "Criteria" will improve the quality of continuing education. I would suggest that this is possible if the new "Criteria" function as finely gauged precision tools unlike the more standard tools formerly employed to assess continuing education. (Perhaps this is why the accreditation guide is now termed "criteria for accreditation" rather then "standards".) New tools for measuring all educational programs must be more sensitive and precise because of the heterogeneity and unique features of the many new audiences served by higher education.

Nearly a year ago, Dean Al Buccino, Dean of the College of Education at the University of Georgia, commented to the Department Chairs of his College, "We are witnessing a shift in society about education from a preoccupation with inputs to a preoccupation with outputs." I agree with this remark and would add that the new older students on our campuses and the economic climate of our country are two major factors contributing to the shift.

Related to these factors of emphasis on outputs and economic pressures, listen to some of Jim Rogers' comments in Knoxville about the recent revision of standards:

"The commission recently completed a revision of the standards and developed a new emphasis which has as one of its major components, the measurement of the effectiveness of an institution's programs. The 'Criteria for Accreditation,' a document which has restructured the standards to include a major new emphasis on planning and evaluation, will move our efforts to a new level of effectiveness, especially as they relate to your area. The 'Criteria' will serve as a tool for achieving this goal by improving the quality of your programs and ascribing to these programs a legitimacy equal to any in the academic arena. But you may ask—why the shift? Weren't the old standards acceptable measurements for identifying quality education programs? The answer is: PARTIALLY. The old standards focused exclusively on institutional resources and processes and operated under the assumption that if an institution had certain resources and used certain processes, effective education would occur. However, new nontraditional institutions, accepted into the membership, spurred new thinking regarding nontraditional programs and nontraditional means of learning. We could no longer be comfortable in our outdated images of higher education. We could no longer evaluate programs along traditional lines because we could not always evaluate traditional resources and processes. At that point, the College Commission began to address the quality issue. Questions we were asking of nontraditional programs seemed equally appropriate for traditional programs. The approach finally adopted was to add to the previous reliance on consideration of inputs, a

significantly greater emphasis on the evaluation of institutional effectiveness on the results of the educational process. As we developed the idea, committee members suggested that both measures be used concurrently—that we evaluate inputs and processes as well as the results of these processes."

Allow me to carry on with Jim's comments a bit further.

> "In conjunction with this new direction of looking at the effectiveness of an institution and, in turn, redefining quality, students also redefined their concepts and attitudes about academic quality. In 1977, students defined academic quality in terms of institutional characteristics: quality of the faculty and quality of the student body as determined by SAT scores (inputs). In 1985, students defined academic quality in terms of 'after college' criteria: i.e., the number of graduates gaining acceptance to professional schools and the number securing desirable jobs in business and industry. Not unlike the descriptions of quality outlined in the 'Criteria,' students' concepts of academic quality shifted from descriptors of the college to the outcomes of an educational process. Consequently, it was no surprise to find that the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching conducted a study tracking the undergraduate major. Among other things, it found that 'American undergraduates in their choice of majors are increasingly preoccupied with preparation for jobs.' Higher education is 'labor intensive',—students look more to the practical, material benefits from college—the outcomes of the educational process. Consequently, a part of the new emphasis of the 'Criteria' reflects this educational priority of society. All of higher education will be better served if these new 'Criteria' advance a more intense look at ouputs, and continuing education is no exception."

In summarizing these initial remarks from Jim Rogers' address to this region's members of the National University Continuing Education Association, I wish to underscore three issues:

1) Economic and demographic shifts will drive higher education's decision making about what types of services will be offered by the higher education community. The implications for adult students are even more preoccupied with jobs and job shifts than their younger counterparts on-and-off-campus. The almost overnight creation of eighteen corporate colleges reflects the societal recognition that lifelong learning for survival in a technological world is imperative.

2) The emphasis on outputs from both traditional programs will heighten again due to economic concerns and priorities of students in the 1980s and 1990s.

3) The tools of measure outputs, that is results of training, learning transfer, or behavioral changes related to education are generally crude. Accrediting bodies are going to be challenged to find individuals qualified to define what outputs "should be" expected in both traditional and nontraditional programs and definitely exasperated in locating individuals capable of conducting output studies and assessments. To be as precise as possible, the new evaluative tools will need to incorporate both quantitative and qualitative methodologies.The state of the art in qualitative evaluation is primitive and the pool of individuals skilled in preparing, managing, and interpreting qualitative evaluations is miniscule.

Dr. Rogers' told us in Knoxville:

> "In the new 'Criteria,' as you no doubt know, continuing education is incorporated into the major section on educational programs. It is no longer an entity unto itself. The 'Criteria' mainstreams the special programs and

> elevates them to an equal level along with undergraduates and graduate programs. It's very placement in the document–preceding faculty requirements and following graduate programs–indicates that is viewed as a stantial program area in higher education and is deserving of the same level of attention as all other academic activities of an institution."

I personally have mixed emotions about the implications of this placement of continuing education. First, if the separate placement for continuing education in the old standards meant that it was perceived as an "add-on" in higher education (Jim's words), then certainly incorporating it into the main body of the "Criteria" is improving the perception of its worth in the higher education community. However, if the new incorporated placement will mean that continuing education will be forced to adopt traditional practices that have proven insensitive to some of the unique needs of nontraditional adult audiences, then perhaps a "separate-but-equal" standard criteria would be more desirable. However, Jim's comments are reassuring that the new "Criteria" will embrace creative approaches to instruction:

> "The 'Criteria' places equal emphasis on process and results, freeing continuing education programs to address concepts of educational delivery and new uses of technology in teaching. For example, it allows for new concepts such as telecourses–courses which embrace large numbers of new and different clientele. Such innovative instructional methods were not clearly provided for in the old standards. The 'Criteria' encourages institutions, and continuing education progams in particular, to be even more creative in developing new ways of reaching potential learners. . ."

Although, I have suggested there is a tremendous challenge facing accrediting bodies on the matter of evaluating outputs of educational programs, I applaud the commitment to do so. My own research related to outputs of continuing education programs indicates that we must intensify our efforts to assess transfer of learning from educational programs to work and other settings. Although the general growth of continuing education programs for professionals indicates individual and organizational satisfaction with these educational experiences, there is mounting evidence that reports of positive impact of such programs on job behavior deserve challenge. As professional organizations are more rigidly asked to establish the financial creditability of such programs, participants' attendance and self-reports of satisfaction are counting less as measures of actual program value. Questions about on-the-job performance change following programs or learning transfer from courses to tasks are increasingly raised, and in a few situations the continuation of programs threatened when sponsors contend they cannot justify costs.

If the new "Criteria" influence the people in continuing education to conduct more follow-up or impact studies of their programs, then, in my opinion, the implications for adult learners will be extremely positive. Unfortunately, there is considerable evidence in recent literature that learning transfer from program to post-program settings often fail. Although learning transfer from adult education programs to changes in performance and practice following programs may be a central concern of many program planners, impact studies have not been widely implemented. That is, the commitment and energies of those who develop programs has been most often directed toward what happens at a program, not after. The timing and placement of most program evaluations illustrate this emphasis on the program itself rather than knowledge utilization following instruction and training. Moss, Blythe, and Barfield (1978) contend such post measurement yield only a "happiness quotient." Continuing education professionals know it is an all-too-common practice to enclose an evaluation form in the packets of program participants and ask that such be completed before individuals leave the program site. It is reasonable to argue that this is not an effective evaluation practice as these participants will be influenced in their reporting by

such factors as fatigue, and anxiousness to go home, and/or a post-program euphoria from meeting new people, old friends, being stimulated by new ideas, or a jaded disregard for the worth of completing "one more" post-program evaluation form. The information yielded on such forms frequently denotes degrees of satisfaction related to content design, presenters, and other program factors.

The literature is full of studies that report people's levels of satisfaction or self-perceptions of continuing education programs. Most studies report positive satisfaction, but studies that go the next step and attempt to correlate reported satisfaction and self-perceptions tend to show little correlation with actual knowledge utilization following the programs. For certain programs, pre-and post-tests are conducted which additionally provide programmers with information about cognitive gains resulting from program participation. Clark (1981) for example, states that cognitive testing is the primary means for demonstrating accountability to the public resulting from nursing education. Once this information is tallied, those accountable for program justification often make quantum leaps of faith by suggesting their programs had results, outcomes, impacts, or effects on job performance or behavior of participants following programs. It would be advisable for continuing educators to refrain from such lofty leaps and review the studies that demonstrate a lack of evidence to support correlations between program satisfaction and/or cognitive gain, and direct impact on performance or behavior change following programs. In fact, several studies show no correlation between satisfaction and/or cognitive gain and performance. Undoubtedly, affective and cognitive gains will continue to be measured and reported by program evaluators, but as accountability and cost-effectiveness attain greater importance to professional organizations, continuing educators will be expected to design programs with results that are transferred and lasting. The new "Criteria" should help facilitate actions to evaluate learning transfer and thereby improve the quality of continuing education.

REFERENCES

Clark, M.D. A model to evaluate the impact of continuing education for nurses. Ph. D. Dissertation, Northwestern University, 1981.

Holt, M.E. and Courtenay, B. C. An examination of impact evaluations, Continuum (1985) 23-35.

Moss, P.J., Blythe, D. K. and Barfield, B.J. Long-term evaluation in engineering continuing education, 1978 Frontiers in Education Conference Proceedings. L.P. Grayson and J.M. Biedenbach (eds.). Lake Buena Vista, Florida: 1978, 193-198.

Rogers, James. Criteria for accreditation: A tool for a future of excellence for continuing education programs in the south. Keynote Address, NUCEA Region III Conference Program, Knoxville, Tennessee, 1985.

IMPLICATIONS OF NEW CRITERIA FOR HIGHER EDUCATION'S CHANGING CLIENTELE

Herman B. Smith
Institute of Higher Education
The University of Georgia

At the offset I must express publicly my appreciation for the skill employed by Dr. Fincher and his associates in designing this conference. His success is reflected by the composition and complexion of the various segments of the program. Thus, I am exposed again, as I have been for the past 19 years of association with him on this campus, to Cameron's peerlessness in working effectively with people and in his attending to all details in his planning and execution. Some of us have said many times during the years that Cameron always covers all bases. He has done it in planning this conference--ethnic considerations, gender considerations, senior professionals, younger professionals, varied interests including vocational considerations--and this is typical of Cameron.

As I look at this audience, I see much more heterogeneity than I have seen typically in other conferences in this room. That is just the way Cameron Fincher works. Cameron, I join others in thanking you again this morning.

With great interest and inevitable recollections, I have listened to the preceeding speakers during this valuable conference. Now it is my turn to offer some comments on the assigned topic: "Implications of New Criteria for Higher Education's Changing Clientele". Having announced the topic I shall proceed as the proverbial minister who intones solemnly his topic, presents his scriptural basis, and then departs from his topic not to return until it is time to "open the doors of the church" to receive new members.

I listened with interest to Ron Simpson's presentation of definitions of "implications". Cameron said that my responsibility, also, was to discuss implications. Ron, after checking his dictionary, defined implications as "twisting or bringing together or working in such a manner to tie some elements together as you see them". I now shall proceed to "twist".

There is an advantage to being one of the last speakers because by this time everything has been covered. Margaret Holt just spoke about "Implications of the Criteria for Learners." Obviously I too am speaking about learners. I am concerned about learners. Margaret has covered all those fine academically defensible points regarding learners. So I can just be Herman Smith as Cameron knew I would be and speak to you in terms of some concerns that I see and feel.

"Higher education's changing clientele"--I did not have the privilege of discussing this topic with Cameron, so I cannot be positive about what he had in mind when he devised it. However, I have pondered these words which are, in my judgment, a type of euphemism. "Higher education's changing clientele", I conclude, focuses upon those segments of our society which have not been served very well in the past: ethnic minorities, older citizens, citizens with various physical handicaps, and, of course, people who suffer serious economic disadvantage. But changing clientele bring to higher education new or different perceptions about many specifics. They bring often different backgrounds, life experiences, and styles; they bring additional skills and potential as well as needs and major interests sometimes. There is a difference; there must be when the new clientele arrives. All of these elements are legitimate and worthy of consideration in the higher education experience. But at the same time, the changing clientele bring much that other traditional arrivals bring to the higher education scene.

So there is a difference and at the same time there is not a difference, and it seems to me that those of us who are responsible for planning and delivering academic service should understand that and govern ourselves accordingly.

I have pondered the various presentations made during this conference in the light of demographic and other information to which I have been exposed during the past few weeks in the course of my professional responsibilities. I have reflected further upon two statements made earlier by two previous speakers. Dr. Rogers of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools said at dinner last evening, "the winds of change are blowing in higher education with brutal force." What a striking statement! His pronouncement suggests serious implications. As one dedicated to being a catalyst, I personally applaud those winds. He implied that the winds are surging and raging, not blowing gently.

Second, I continue to reflect upon the enumeration by Tom Redmon of top positive factors that help a learner to achieve the outcomes stated. Tom listed caring attitude of faculty and staff, high quality teaching, and then he also talked about involvement in various campus activities. I thought about myself in terms of who I am, who I have been, where I have been, where I am this morning and where I might be. If all of you are looking up here, you can see me, you are able to interpret the statement. I have responded to all of this as I think about how I happened to enter college as the first one in my family to enroll in college and graduate. I and others similarly situated presented ourselves to the college officials not knowing very much about all the theory of higher education and the criteria, standards, etcetera, but the teachers let us know that the assigned educational tasks must be accomplished.

We were very much impressed with the importance of being in college. Then the teachers proceeded to let us know that we would achieve those objectives, and that we could achieve those objectives. Then they said, "I can help you" and "I will help you." Early in our college career, then, a favorable, supportive climate for learning and achieving was established. I knew that I would be there for the ride and that I would make it to the finish line. I think this is what Tom Redmon was speaking about.

I would state that one specific on his list was not present in my situation. He said "adequate financial aid." Tom, I did not have any financial aid, I did not have any money, but I did the best I could. I am able to testify publicly this morning that I was so busy trying to earn the tuition and be able to pay the costs the coming Fall that I did not have time to be poor. I did not have time to be disadvantaged; and I did not even have time to be different. I was just a college student with no money who had been inspired by his high school teachers to enroll and accept the tiny scholarship offered, no financial aid. I concluded, once enrolled, that I must get busy and I had better get busy, and so I did.

I am very conscious of the fact that this conference by design is focused, or is supposed to be focused, upon higher education in Georgia. I assume that if I were in a conference that was focusing upon higher education in Wisconsin or Oregon or Iowa or Idaho, there might be some different considerations before us.

I am informed that in one sense there are really two Georgias: urban Georgia and rural Georgia. One Georgia is basically or comparatively rich; the other Georgia is poor. You have read as I that the state's urban counties contain only 5.3 to 15.2% of the population below the poverty level, while in rural Georgia between 19.5 and 40.7% of the people live in something called poverty. Yet all Georgians are individuals of potential and ability and all Georgians deserve the chance for a higher education if they desire or see the light. How will the opportunity and the need--and we do have the need--for all Georgians to have their potential developed be addressed? How will that need be achieved? When the factor of race is added to the above, a challenge is compounded markedly.

Georgia's more than one million public school students, as I read, are the tenth largest number or assembly of students in the country, but as of 1980 only 56% of Georgia's residents were high school graduates. On this dimension our state is 43rd from the top of this ranking nationwide. So there is much that must be done here to serve our people. We will have people who need to be educated for years to come if we can decide to respond to their needs and their potential. There will not be a shortage of people.

Many details which surfaced during my recent trips to Washington kept swirling through my consciousness as the preceeding speakers have continued. For example, in discussions in one office of demographic data it was pointed out that 29% more black students graduated from high school in 1982 than in 1975, but black enrollment in college dropped 11% during the period. Why? What is today's trend and is that trend still observable? High school graduation rate for Hispanics increased 38% during the 1975 and 1982 period while Hispanic college enrollment declined 16%. Are we doing better here today?

We are talking about Americans and Georgians and citizens who need the benefit of higher education and who have potential for succeeding. I believe, whether or not it has been expressed very well, deep down all these individuals do have an aspiration to be successful.

Nationally I read that one half of all college students enrolled this academic year are holding jobs, a proportion that has risen steadily over the last 25 years. Many factors help to account for this phenomenon. One factor has to be the increasing diversity of clientele pursuing higher education and that report has many substantial implications then for the higher education experience.

Finally, I have reflected upon many individuals whom I have known who despite all the odds have made their way to receptive, apparently capable, institutions of higher education and who have succeeded in accomplishing the set task. I have mused during these hours as to how this was done and the benefits to be derived if the explanation for these success stories could be distilled, collected, organized, understood, interpreted and then internalized. We might move ahead and provide more adequately for the climate and services needed in Georgia to make our educational efforts more effective.

I reflect inevitably upon the slogan that has been used at Atlanta University through the years: "I will find a way or make one." The expression reflects a determination to succeed in providing appropriate educational service for people despite all handicaps or impediments.

The foregoing are among those thoughts and ruminations which have flooded my consciousness as I have observed the various presenters and followed their respective statements. The recital of my reactions and reflections provide a background for the five specific implications which I have distilled from this experience. I will merely recite the implications with little commentary although each one provokes extensive discussion.

1. The existing use and growing prominence of criteria is an established fact of life in higher education. This is not a lamentation by any means, but a statement of hope and optimism. I applaud the established fact. I participate in many groups from time to time in which is expressed the views that "the cards are stacked against us", "they are no good", "the standards are not for us", "we can't do it", "lets attack them", etcetera, I don't join that crowd. The use and growing prominence of criteria suggests to me the need for a skillful, repetitive, widespread interpretation of the "Criteria," their purposes, their development and of the related implications. That, of course, is what Dr. Rogers was doing last evening. The process must be repeated again and again in all kinds of circles it seems to me.

The interpretations should seek, unfailingly, to communicate to all that a central concern of the effort is to strengthen institutions and to strengthen their respective positions and potential to provide needed service in their areas of operation. The heightening attention to the "Criteria" and standards suggests to me that institutions are enhancing their quality as they continue to pursue their respective objectives and institutional commitments.

2. At the same time that justifible attention is given to administering the "Criteria," it is imperative that adequate sensitive recognition be given to the human considerations or the subjects who will receive the impact of the "Criteria." I am happy to say that I have arrived at a point where I never become so inebriated about the paper and the statements contained thereon that I really do not focus enough attention upon the reason for the rhetoric–the people. There is a person in our midst who raised the question yesterday, "what about that human element, would you expand upon that?" We must always, it seems to me give, adequate attention, sensitive attention, to the human considerations.

3. It would appear that any institution which commits itself to the attraction, preparation, and graduation of changing or new clientele would at time of making such a service commitment proceed to effect appropriate changes from its traditional and historic patterns, designs and approaches to the task. The commitment to serving new clientele has far reaching implications for the institution. The institution then must change in every respect because the new clientele bring with them differences as I sought to enumerate earlier.

4. The challenge of identifying, soliciting, admitting, preparing or serving, graduating and helping to induct the new clientele is so great and complex that a durable, dynamic, and creative collaboration of people and organizations is necessary to enhance chances for success. It seems to me that the educational institution alone is hardly adequate for the task. At the Kettering Foundation we believe in this collaboration–a broad-based cooperation that would include many people and many kinds of organizations. Only by such procedure can we realize the greatest benefit from or impact of the "Criteria." I perceive that Jim Rogers and his associates understand that and that is why they are interpreting and discussing the "Criteria" so widely in our state and region. This "reaching out" activity is critical. The process should include all the people back home, the ordinary taxpayers, the parent, etcetera.

5. Finally, and I think this is a very important consideration, the new clientele should not be expected or required to assume total responsibility for extricating itself from the condition of being new clientele. All of us must help. We have an inescapable responsiblity for so serving.

Mine is an idealistic perception perhaps, but nothing less will serve me. Had this not been so, I surely would not be here in this place today on this podium. An earlier member of the changing clientele, a man who originated in Epworth, South Carolina, made a statement some years ago which is repeated again and again. I think the quotation is germane to my response to what I have heard and perceived at this meeting. The individual of whom I speak is the late Dr. Benjamin E. Mays. These are his words: "It must be borne in mind that the tragedy in life doesn't lie in not reaching the goal; the tragedy lies in having no goal to reach. It is not a calamity to die with dreams unfulfilled, but it is a calamity not to dream. It is not a disaster to be unable to capture your ideal"–and we would strongly state that we must have them–"but it is a disaster to have no ideal to capture. It is not a disgrace not to reach the stars; but it is a disgrace to have no stars to reach for. Not failure," said that departed South Carolinian and member of the new clientele at the time, "but low aim is sin." May we–each of us here assembled–in our future work as educators in Georgia be free of the sin of low aim.

CHANGING ACCREDITATION CRITERIA: CATALYST TO EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION?

Sven Groennings
Institute of Higher Education
The University of Georgia

The purpose of my remarks will be to suggest that it is inevitable that the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' new outcomes-focused "Criteria" for institutional accreditation will induce educational innovation. One might anticipate, on the basis of reviewing our experience with FIPSE projects, that the innovations will be many and far-reaching. That could be a very interesting, lively and constructive prospect.

Accreditation processes have been a force for the improvement of quality across the years, helpful to institutions and to consumers and promotive of public credibility and trust. The notion that the legitimate missions of institutions can be diverse and many and that standards should be related to purposes, and effectiveness to objectives, has been a boon to innovation in this country.

An exception is associated with beyond-the-campus phenomena which are recent. Input-oriented criteria, among them library resources, have been barriers to non-traditional education and perhaps especially to the distance learning made possible by modern technologies. Innovators viewed accreditation as a barrier to certain kinds of access at a time when the great problem in higher education was access. Now that the great concern is shifting from access to the quality of learning and includes a focus on institutional effectiveness, on outcomes which might be achieved in many ways, and not only on traditional inputs, accrediting agencies have special opportunities for leadership.

The shift to an outcomes focus—a focus on the learner—makes it possible to encourage a wider range of modes of learning and thus for accreditation processes to encourage both quality and innovation more powerfully than ever before.

Moreover and predictably, the new "Criteria" will be catalytic to innovation for at least the following seven reasons:

1. The Southern Association's outcomes focus is part of an evolving movement which will reinforce the thrust of the Southern Association and provide a wider set of stimuli to innovation. For example, the NIE panel which produced "Involvement in Learning" recommended that measures of student growth and development be used as indicators of institutional and programmatic excellence;

2. The outcomes focus is an appropriate answer and arguably one of the best answers to the demand for improvement in the quality of education, and may be politically important in securing support for higher education and avoiding undesirable intrusions by state governments;

3. The outcomes "Criteria" are fundamentally different from the old criteria. They change the assumptions about what is important, in effect putting in place new building blocks for wide-ranging planning and operations;

4. All institutions will have to adapt, each meeting the new expectation in its own way;

5. The possible ways to meet the "Criteria" are many; indeed the Southern Association's "Criteria" explicitly

indicate the the paths are many, and we may furthermore anticipate that the effects will extend, in a variety of ways, to faculties, departments, whole institutions and even systems;

6. This change should set in motion a continuing process with feedback, so that improvement and innovation will proceed in either stages or as continuing change. It is explicit in the Southern Association's "Criteria" that there shall be continuing programs of institutional research, which can themselves be innovators. It is implicit in this change of focus that accreditors look at process, not one-time outcomes or snapshots at long intervals, but at the institutionalization of process and feedback loops.

7. Because implementation will be difficult in terms of methodology, faculty and counseling development and expense, and because implementation will be a many-splendored phenomenon and people will be looking for models and hoping for helpful dissemination, there will probably be a need to create some kinds of incentive funders, whose activity in itself will be catalytic for innovation.

It seems to me that we have before us in these new "Criteria," which might seem innocuous or routinely common-sensical to some of its readers, some potentially powerful stimuli to change which portend national leadership for this region. While there is some risk of stumbling, there is also an opportunity to be the leader.

One hesitates to over-interpret anything not yet implemented, but as a political scientist, whose own field is heavily concerned with constitutional engineering, i.e. the effect of changes in the rules upon behavior, I have a bias toward interpreting this kind of change as likely to be broadly consequential and even to have serendipitous effects. For example, when European political systems decided that the results of elections should be reflected by proportional representation rather than by declaring a single winner, there followed controversies about the mathematical formulas for distributing the seats and about the thresholds for winning any, and there followed changes in the ballot, the election districts, the nominating process, the number of parties, and legislative behavior, including the pattern of coalition governments. The whole system performed differently following this fundamental change in how to assign value to a process—in this case election rather than education. In parallel, anyone who constructs education scenarios analytically may work with one new independent variable but a whole flock of dependent variables.

Thus I want to suggest the prospect that the systematic implications of the outcomes focus may be every bit as important a consideration as the methodological problems of measuring the outcomes. Indeed, I will be elaborating this point.

Scenario construction is not my function today. I am part of this panel primarily because of my experience as Director of FIPSE, whose portfolio of projects, which range across all fields, have included a few real-world experiences pertinent to the implications of meeting the Southern Association's criteria. The cases will probably be of interest to potential adapters and innovators, and will lead to some conclusions and recommendations.

Introducing Nine Projects

There are two kinds of pertinent concerns which have attracted FIPSE support. Each is characterized by extraordinary complexity. One is the set of problems posed by technological innovation for state authorizing agencies and for accrediting agencies. The other is work toward the assessment of outcomes. Of the nine projects I will mention, eight were FIPSE-supported.

Technolgical innovation, which brought us not only new educational programs but also realizable visions of electronic universities and new institutions such as the recently founded National Technolgical University, forced us to face problems associated with

crossing jurisdictional lines. Basically, we faced one big problem in three related parts, namely state authorization of programs, accrediting criteria, and the underlying definition of legal presence in any state. Because of the linkages, an outcomes focus for accreditation would be only a necessary but not a sufficient condition of success in solving the problem of delivering technologically innovation educational programs.

Innovative approaches to learning faced a web or system of structural barriers, namely dealing with each state's and accrediting region's requirements, which vary and involve time-consuming and costly processes and could be mechanisms for stifling outside competition, and a tangle of legal concerns involving constitutional issues relating to states' rights and interstate commerce and—most fundamentally—the absence of either any clear definition of "physical presence" to serve as the basis for state sovereignty or any body of pertinent case law. If we could not surmount these problems, we would be limited in our ability to reach learners and to reap the benefits of our inventiveness.

Segments of the system began to respond. In 1973 the Education Commission of the States published model legislation for state authorization, and in 1978 the Council of Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) recommended that the accrediting model be reconstructed to include assessment of educational outcomes. It was COPA's perception that criteria focusing on the assessing of outcomes would be a key factor in promoting innovation.

The next step, with FIPSE's support, was Project ALLTEL, "Assessing Long Distance Learning Via Telecommunications," a joint project of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the State Higher Education Executive Officers (COPA-SHEEO). The purpose was to develop an encompassing strategy to ensure educational quality, promote the best use of the emerging technologies, and cut back the multiple accrediting and state authorizing activities.

The summary report, which actually is long, detailed, and includes task force reports, was issued in October, 1985. It calls for common procedures for authorization and accreditation, thereby circumventing legal issues. Secondly, it calls for a single and generally accepted format for institutional provision of information which indeed now is being field-tested. Thirdly, it calls for the development of reciprocity among the states and the accreditors. The country now has these principles and procedures and the proposed strategy for its consideration. The Implementation Task Force is promoting working agreements between and among authorizing and accrediting bodies. In this region, Florida, Texas, and Virginia have decided to use the Institutional Profile.

The fact that this report bears the imprimatur of both COPA and SHEEO in itself makes it a landmark. Dissemination has been occurring, so that familiarization with the problems and proposals has been increasing, and the two organizations are continuing to work together. Their Accreditation Task Force has urged the adoption of outcomes measures and explicitly makes the linkage to innovation. COPA-SHEEO's work adds to the overall thrust of the new Southern Association "Criteria" and provides a wider set of stimuli to innovation.

All the other projects to which I will be referring address problems of organizing to measure outcomes. One project involves the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges and the Accrediting commission for Community and Junior Colleges of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

These two organizations have reached an agreement on their roles, have conducted dozens of workshops to improve institutional and agency evaluation and planning activities, and have been addressing issues involving the measurement of learner outcomes. Their staff papers state that it is only through the evaluation of learner outcomes that colleges can monitor changes in the quality of their work and determine if they are being effective.

They foresee testing for competencies, wish to contribute to the improvement of learner outcome measurements, and have developed an "Item Bank and Handbook" which is now being tested by colleges as part of their accrediting self studies.

In asking themselves what kinds of outputs/outcomes to seek, they considered institutional assessments weak along two dimensions. They wanted to know much more about how many transferred and how they performed at the senior institution, how many were placed in jobs, and to what extent college work helped people to become useful citizens. They found they also wanted to know what growth in skills, knowledge, and understanding of values students experienced while enrolled, and therefore wanted to note their characteristics at entry, their work at the college, and the purpose to which they put that work after finishing their program. Furthermore, they contemplated the virtual certainty that the assessment of competencies would need to include a wide variety of techniques, among them interviews, performance examinations, review of experience, and standardized tests, and they stated that assessment would need to include the diagnosing of educational needs.

They were interested in feedback, believing the results of outcomes-oriented evaluation should lead to decisions which improve the learning process. In order to enable colleges to make comparisons with one another, they have proposed to make the Chancellor's office a depository for aggregated data, finding this approach both analytically effective and cost-effective.

The enormous challenge would be to figure out appropriate ways to measure achievement, and especially to measure change. California community colleges may be the nation's most varied set of institutions in student age, ethnicity and lifestyles, and maybe also in employment and residential patterns. There is a phenomenal range in student purposes, preparation and capabilities. Moreover, nearly all future enrollment increase will be of part-time students, and perhaps their objectives differ from those of full-time students, e.g. perhaps most will be enrolled to gain occupational skills. Not only are there mammoth problems in trying to assess change, but also it would be likely to be necessary to re-orient advisement in major ways.

Indeed, the implications were virtually sprawling in all directions. They perceived that a focus on outcomes would necessitate contemplating an amazing array of changes and innovations which would add up to fundamental institutional renewal, including changing the sense of responsibilities, changing the mode of instruction, changing the capabilities of the teaching staff as well as the advising staff, possibly new articulation with nontraditional providers, renewal of programs, improved management and coordination, financial incentives for professional and organizational development, and inter-institutional collaboration to prepare faculty and administrators.

It may be fruitful for those interested in the Southern Association's new "Criteria" to follow these developments in California, which incidentally extend to Hawaii, because aspects are in the early stages of becoming operational. It may also be instructive to watch parallel developments in certain specialized fields.

I would like to mention two FIPSE projects related to the field of business. They illustrate different points.

For perhaps a dozen years the American Academy of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) has been contemplating outcomes measures, and some five years ago received a FIPSE grant for what was then called "The Accreditation Research Project" but is now known as "The Outcomes Measurement Project." The original question, as I recall, was: What are the most reputable outcomes for the BBA and MBA?

Now ready are two sets of instruments. One deals with seven sets of knowledge areas in the field of business. The other instrument

focuses on skills, such as ability to communicate.

AACSB is now at the point of gathering data to determine national norms for outcomes. It is far from ready to put outcomes measures in accreditation standards. It is contemplating using outcomes measures as an alternative path to accreditation, so that there would be two acceptable processes, at least as an interim phase.

AACSB thus has, as a matter of its own choice in trying to be constructive, a "hot potato":

—the danger of being threatening to some of its constituency

—the danger of teaching to the instruments

—and internal pressure stemming from the fact that AACSB includes in its membership both accredited and non-accredited schools. The latter are "chomping at the bit" for the opportunity to prove themselves in alternative ways, including Northeast Missouri State, which is a leader in advancing the value-added concept. Clearly, the introduction of outcomes criteria would be a boon to non-traditional providers, e.g. the Arthur D. Little Management Education Institute, which educates numerous foreigners under A.I.D. contracts.

The second FIPSE project in the field of business illustrates how AACSB has been an engine of reform by setting accreditation standards.

In 1974 AACSB stated that "The purpose of the curriculum shall be . . . preparing the student for . . . roles in business and society—domestic and worldwide." In 1980 it tightened the meaning: "There is no intention that any single approach is required to satisfy the worldwide dimension of the curriculum standard, but every student should be exposed to the international dimension through one or more elements of the curriculum."

As deans and faculties wondered how to meet this new standard, AACSB began a series of seminars to help faculty teach international courses, namely, international finance, international marketing, international management, international accounting, and introduction to international business.

The AACSB international standard calls for reaching every undergraduate business student, but, like the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, AACSB doesn't tell anybody how to do it. It is at this point that the new rules of the game stimulate innovation.

In the case of the AACSB standard, the strategic choices are to incorporate international business concepts into the core of functional courses or to offer separate international business courses. An institution might offer an international core course, a global perspective throughout the core courses, international modules within the core courses, or required international courses within the student's specializations. Any of these approaches would meet the AACSB standard.

It became apparent that there would be a need for models, dissemination, and financial support for innovation in internationalizing the business curriculum.

Accordingly, it was appropriate for institutions to turn to FIPSE, and thus FIPSE could play a supportive role for the implementation of the AACSB standard.

FIPSE decided to support a three-year project involving a consortium of small universities in the Northwest, with Pacific Lutheran University at the center, to develop jointly a comprehensive program to internationalize their curricula, including interdisciplinary cooperation and the development of nine modules for inclusion in all the non-quantitative undergraduate core business courses. FIPSE was not supporting any major university's traditional strategy involving the hiring of experts to prepare specialized courses and to produce experts for specialized institutions such as international banks. It

sought to support a significant model involving small institutions which do not have a doctoral program, and which would prefer to pursue a modular infusion strategy. These small institutions would not be hiring new faculty, and it is not their function to produce experts. Their students would be hired by small and middle-sized firms and would be expected to become familiar with doing international business as part of doing American business more broadly. The desired curriculum would also be useful in developing workshops for employees of local firms.

The challenge inherent in this strategy is two-fold. The first challenge is developing the modules, and incidentally, the appeal of this modular infusion strategy has become apparent as more than 40 institutions have requested the modules. The second challenge is retooling the faculties, i.e. one could not change the teaching and learning to meet the standard without faculty development.

Also along the international dimension, new standards are being developed in the foreign language field as the globalization of the economy forces greater attention to practical communication and therefore to foreign language oral proficiency testing. The prime motor in this case has not been the accrediting agency, but a professional association. With the Exxon Education Foundation, FIPSE is supporting the development of foreign language proficiency testing. What is important for our focus today is that this case also shows the inevitably broad catalytic effect of a change in expected outcomes. This will illustrate that such a change necessarily will induce innovations.

The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) states that "Measurable foreign language proficiency is integral to the advancement of the profession and essential to its credibility."

Testing instruments are being developed and tested for the most common languages and will be developed for more. We are in the early stage of establishing a national system of testing for skills attainment. Given the long experience of the Foreign Service Institute with proficiency testing and the careful work done in developing appropriate metrics, I believe this will be impressively successful. I am confident also because the assessment of achievement involves meeting an absolute standard at each of the five levels of measurement; ACTFL's program does not attempt to measure individual progress in the sense of value added from any starting point, but only absolute student achievement, i.e. levels of competence.

This will be a fundamental change with profound implications. It will signal the importance of learning a foreign language as a skill to be used. It will motivate and enable students and teachers to earn credentials based on recognized standards, while providing yardsticks of progress. Moving the measurement of achievement from a semesters-passed criterion to one based on proficiency will allow people to proceed toward credentialing however and wherever they choose, while fostering continuity and linkages across levels of education. There will be the additional benefit of establishing benchmarks of accountability for teachers.

We may anticipate that the establishment of such a system will have catalytic effects on curricular development and evaluation, on the design of teaching materials, and on parallel testing in increasing numbers of languages. The point is the same profound point being made de facto by the Southern Association: changing the scorekeeping changes the game.

In the case of ACTFL, we are talking about competency or outcomes testing, and immediately we started talking about all the new issues: How could the tests be developed and administered? How would standards be maintained as universal constants when the number of testers increases across the country? Which languages and substantive fields would be included? What emphasis should be placed on diagnostics, which might help learners overcome weaknesses? Is the vision sufficiently encompassing? Where would it be best to do the pilot testing and initial

evaluation? What should be the characteristics of the organizational mechanisms? Should we anticipate regional testing centers to train testers and administer tests? How should dissemination be handled? How do we re-tool faculties? If different agencies are to be involved for different purposes, how should their efforts be coordinated? How would the system be financed? What sort of legitimization and organizational politics are needed to ensure a successful launch?

All these questions arose as the foreign language field decided it should pursue a different kind of learning outcome and institutionalize proficiency measures, and some such questions become new points of departure for innovation.

If the objective is to measure an institution's impact on students very broadly as whole persons, the measures will have to have multiple dimensions. There are three prominent models, provided by notably dissimilar institutions: Alverno College, Northeast Missouri State University (NMSU), and the University of Tennessee. Long before my tenure, FIPSE supported early work with the State of Tennessee and was closely associated with the developments at Alverno. NMSU, which did not have the benefit of outside funding, won the American Association of State Colleges and Universities' 1983 Mitau Award for innovation and change in state colleges and universities.

Alverno overhauled the whole curriculum, focusing it on eight skills outcomes: effective communications, analysis, problem-solving, values in decision-making, social interaction, responsibility for the environment, involvement in the contemporary world, and aesthetic response. The objective was to foster "abilities that last a lifetime." Each of the basic abilities is defined in six increasingly complex levels and these are infused throughout a curriculum which is otherwise organized in a traditional manner substantively. Faculty teach toward the different levels of abilities in their substantive courses; in effect, their responsibility for general student development parallels their responsibility in their field of knowledge.

Alverno uses a variety of assessment techniques and has established both an Assessment Center, which administers assessments, and a faculty Assessment Council to provide technical assistance to faculty. There is also an Office of Research and Evaluation which conducts research into student development and processes of teaching and learning and which evaluates the curriculum. At Alverno, everybody is involved, and a thorough evaluation of the whole program has confirmed that it is a stunning success. It has involved exceptional leadership and commitment, and is not readily replicable, although work in the same direction is now underway with FIPSE support at Clayton Junior College here in Georgia. I suppose that the Alverno approach could only evolve at a small liberal arts college. Alverno happens to be a Catholic women's college in Milwaukee with an enrollment of 1,500. I suppose further that if institutions are going to test for broad outcomes, the testing system itself will be a boon to liberal education.

In contrast to Alverno, the University of Tennessee at Knoxville (UTK) is a multiversity with sixteen colleges and schools, a research institution with strong departments and corresponding decentralization of authority. The prod to its activity has been external financial incentives provided by "performance funding" in statewide budgeting. There was an earlier external stimulus to developing "performance funding" when FIPSE originally co-funded, with the Kellogg and Ford Foundations, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission's pilot project designed to add a performance feature to the appropriations process. Currently, five percent of the overall budget is distributed to institutions on the basis of success in meeting performance criteria. UTK gained Kellogg funding to develop assessments of learning outcomes consistent with the criteria. It has developed a value-added component for general education as well as projects in a substantial number of departments to experiment with measuring outcomes in the disciplines, plus instruments for assessing student and graduate satisfaction. A Learning Research Center provides assistance across the campus.

Northeast Missouri State University, structurally a somewhat typical regional state university, uses standardized testing instruments in assessing value added for its entire student body of 7,000. There are several phases to this activity, both general and field-specific, and there is a quest for patterns that make a difference in learning. Costs are kept down by using existing instruments, and the University cites its efforts to focus on learning and on the development of the individual student in making its general budget requests. The success of this program also is attracting national attention.

Thus, there is a mosiac of activity across the country. These activities, when viewed as a whole, seem a bit unsettling and chaotic, but the chaos has momentum.

Conclusions

For this conference I was asked to draw on my experience with FIPSE to address the implications of new "Criteria" for technological innovation and new approaches.

It seems to me that the implications are far-reaching. The focus on outcomes broadens the basic concept of excellence. The role of accreditation will become increasingly important in the quest for quality and as a catalyst to innovation, and there will be a new dynamic tension between accreditors and institutions. Such tension could be positive.

I am impressed not only by the range of methodological problems in constructing instruments but also by the prospects of systematic complexity within and beyond academic institutions, considerable cost, and a need to encourage initiative in institutional response to the "Criteria."

We will enter an era of groping for assessment tools in both the institutional and specialized accrediting agencies. It will be relatively easy to draw facile inferences from the placement of students beyond the campus. It will be appropriate in some cases to pursue absolute standards in specialized fields. It will be especially difficult to cope with the concept of value added, which involves iterative measurement, and with trying to measure general outcomes. Some approaches may arouse general leeriness.

It may be tempting for some beyond the academy to think that an outcome focus will help the colleges and universities to do more with less, since the objective is not the acquisition of resources but is instead their effective use. It seems clear, to the contrary, that the shift to an outcomes focus could become very expensive, as it suggests more than the construction of measuring instruments. It can involve faculty training and more extensive counseling as well as management costs, all along new dimensions. Therefore, the implications for innovative approaches can be virtually ubiquitous.

We open the door to complexities when we make a seemingly straightforward and reasonable decision to base institutional accountability at least in part on demonstrating progress in advancing student learning. It would be constructive, I submit, to suggest to state legislators that such a change, which fundamentally addresses institutional mission, is certain to be broad in its impact and implications. At a time of emphasis on both educational quality and fiscal constraint, legislators may want to say that the purpose of additional appropriations will be to improve quality. As some legislators may wonder about the effectiveness of the expenditures, we could face two legislative problems. One might be legislator concern about how satisfactorily to assess whether improvement has been occurring. The other is the related specter of an unfolding, changing relationship of academic institutions to state governments which hitherto have stayed away from meddling in the assessment of academic performance. The latter is another "quicksand" or "sleeper" problem for accreditors as well as campuses. Wisely, it has been the American tradition to leave issues of assessment fundamentally in the hands of institutions and accrediting agencies. There may be a need for a broad conversation, in this new context, on institutional relationships as well as on assessment.

Recommendations

Each panelist at this conference was asked to consider offering a recommendation or two.

Recommendations can be mainly of two kinds: The first concerns institutions and programs. They will need to clarify their missions and develop ways to assess learning outcomes and institutionalize the outcomes focus. The second concerns the accreditors, which will need to contemplate being helpful to institutions in new ways as well as how to evaluate the achievement of institutions.

My assigned topic, however, is the implications for innovation. I have tried to make the point that the innovations propelled by the Southern Association's new "Criteria" can be far-reaching, varied from one institution to another in accordance with their varying missions, and costly. Implementation will involve experimentation and time. Institutions will seek models, information and financial help. In time, credibility will be "on the line", and in the meantime there could be delays attributable to concern that other resources will be traded away in order to meet the expense of launching this new undertaking. The South is embarking upon a venture. Yet unlike corporations, colleges and universities do not have venture capital. I recommend that there be consideration to creating incentive funders.

APPENDIX A

"ASSESSMENT, EVALUATION, AND ACCREDITATION"

Third Annual Conference on Research in Postsecondary Education

GEORGIA CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
ATHENS, GA 30602

JANUARY 15-16, 1986

Sponsored by:

THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
Institute of Higher Education
Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Center for Continuing Education

HIGHER EDUCATION IN GEORGIA: ASSESSMENT, EVALUATION, AND ACCREDITATION

Wednesday, January 15th

12:00 - 1:00 p.m. Registration

1:00 - 2:15 p.m. Opening Session

"The Emerging Role of Assessment and Evaluation in Postsecondary Education"

Cameron Fincher
Institute of Higher Education

2:15 - 3:30 p.m. Le-Quita Booth, Chair
First Panel on Assessment

"Assessing Student Achievement"

Joe Marks
Southern Regional Education Board

"Assessing Educational Outcomes"

Tom Redmon
Southern Regional Education Board

"Assessing Vocational Competencies"

Michael McCord
Athens Vocational/Technical School

3:30 - 3:45 p.m. Break

3:45 - 5:00 p.m. Claire Swann, Chair
Second Panel on Assessment

"Needs Assessment in Programs for Health Services Personnel"

Libby Morris
Institute of Higher Education

"Assessing the New Standards for High School Graduation and College Admissions"

Nathaniel Pugh
Georgia Southern

"Needs Assessment in Vocational Programs"

Ken Allen
Georgia State University

5:00 - 6:30 p.m. Conference Recess

6:30 p.m. Dinner Session

"The New Criteria for Accreditation"

James T. Rogers
Commission on Colleges
Southern Association of Colleges & Schools

Thursday, January 16th

8:30 - 10:00 a.m. Katherine Boardman, Chair
Panel on Implications of SACS' New Criteria for:

"Institutional Research"

Larry Jones
Office of Institutional Research & Planning

"Developmental Studies"

Leroy Ervin
Division of Developmental Studies/UGA

"Instructional Development"

Ronald Simpson
Office of Instructional Development/UGA

"Admissions"

John Albright
Office of Admissions/UGA

10:00 - 10:15 a.m. Break

10:15 - 11:30 a.m. Rick Rose, Chair
Panel on Implications of SACS' New Criteria for:

"Learners"

Margaret Holt
Department of Adult/Continuing Education

"Higher Education's Changing Clientele"

Herman Smith
Visiting University Professor
Institute of Higher Education

"Technological Innovation and New Approaches"

Sven Groennings
Visiting Professor
Institute of Higher Education

11:30 - 12:15 p.m. Open discussion and recommendations for assessment and evaluation in institutional accreditation